

City of Winters

2002 Housing Needs Assessment

DECEMBER, 2004

Prepared by Parsons

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION.....	1
Findings	2
Population Trends	2
Income and Poverty	2
Employment Trends	2
Special Needs	2
Housing Characteristics	3
Housing Costs and Affordability	4
Opportunities and Constraints	4
 HOUSING NEEDS AND OPPORTUNITIES	 5
Development History	5
Population Characteristics	5
Population Trends	5
Ethnicity	6
Age of Population	7
Household Type and Composition	8
Income Characteristics	9
Poverty	12
Employment Trends	13
Area Employment Profile	13
Employment Projections	14
Special Housing Needs	16
Persons 65 and Over	16
Mobility and Self-Care Limitations	17
Families with Female Heads of Households	18
Large Families	19
Farmworkers	19
Homeless	20
Agencies Offering Public Assistance to Homeless and Other Special Needs Groups	20
Housing Characteristics	22
Housing Composition	22
Housing Occupancy	23
Vacancy	23
Homeownership	24
Tenure	25
Age and Condition of Housing Stock	26
Housing Unit and Property Conditions	27
Overcrowding	28
Housing Costs	29
Rental Apartments	29
Home Prices	31
Home Prices in Surrounding Areas	32
Lower Income Households Overpaying	32
Affordability Trends	33
Assisted Housing Projects	34
Assisted Rental Housing Eligible for Conversion	34
Affordable housing Development	37
Future Housing Needs	38

Future Development Potential	39
Areas with Potential for Residential Development.....	39
Areas with Redevelopment and/or Re-Use Potential	46
Existing Infrastructure	51
Public Services.....	51

CONSTRAINTS 52

Non-Governmental Constraints	52
Land Costs	52
Construction and Labor Costs	53
The Cost and Availability of Financing.....	54
Governmental Constraints.....	54
Land Use Controls	55
Conditional Use Permit Process	56
Permitted Uses in Residential Zoning Districts	57
Building Codes	61
Development Fees	61
School Impact Fees	63
Yolo County Impact Fees	63
Planning Fees	63
On and Off-site Improvement Requirements	64
Permit Processing Procedures	65
Constraints to Housing Persons with Disabilities.....	67
Second Unit Requirements	70
Manufactured Home and Mobile Home Park Standards	70
Parking Requirements	71
Design Review	71
Winters Design Guidelines	73

ENERGY CONSERVATION OPPORTUNITIES 75

General Design Standards	75
--------------------------------	----

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1 Winters Population Growth	5
Table 2 Winters and Yolo County Population Growth 1990-2020	6
Table 3 Comparison of Race by City, County, and State Population	7
Table 4 Age Distribution (2000)	7
Table 5 Number of Persons per Household (2000).....	8
Table 6 Household Composition by Type (2000).....	9
Table 7 Median Incomes in Winters and Yolo County (2000).....	9
Table 8 Household Income (1990 and 2000).....	10
Table 9 Definitions Used for Comparing Income Levels.....	10
Table 10 City of Winters and Yolo County Household Income Range by Income Category (2000)	11
Table 11 Yolo County Income Limits (2004)	12
Table 12 Poverty Thresholds (2001)	12
Table 13 Winters Poverty Rates (2000)	13
Table 14 Major Employers in the City of Winters.....	14
Table 15 Occupational Employment and Wage Data for Yolo County (2001).....	15
Table 16 Yolo County Employment Projections as Related to Job Growth (1997-2004).....	16
Table 17 Pattern of Aging of the Winters Population	17
Table 18 Housing Estimates for the City of Winters (1990 through 2000 and 2004).....	22
Table 19 Housing Estimates for Yolo County (1990 through 2000 and 2004).....	23
Table 20 Housing Occupancy (2000)	24

Table 21 Homeownership Rates (2000)	24
Table 22 Homeownership Rates by Age (2000).....	25
Table 23 Tenure by Race and Hispanic Origin (2000).....	26
Table 24 Age of Housing Units (2000)	27
Table 25 Housing Related Code Violations (2002)	27
Table 26 Persons Per Room in All Occupied Housing Units (2000).....	28
Table 27 Overcrowded Housing (2000)	29
Table 28 Rental Rates for Apartment in Winters and Surrounding Cities (January 2002)	30
Table 29 Fair Market Rents for Existing Housing in Yolo County (2002).....	30
Table 30 Winters Mobile Home Park	31
Table 31 Resale Home Sold in Winters (2001).....	31
Table 32 New Homes Sale Prices in Winters (March 2002)	32
Table 33 Median Home Prices for Winters and Surrounding Areas (January 2002)	32
Table 34 Housing Expenditures by Income Group (2000)	33
Table 35 Affordability of Rental Housing in Relation to Income (2000).....	33
Table 36 Sold Units Affordable to Lower-Income Households (2001).....	34
Table 37 Assisted Rental Units	35
Table 38 Non-Profit Housing Organization Interested in Acquiring At-Risk Rental Housing	37
Table 39 Regional Housing Needs Allocation (2000-2007)	39
Table 40 Winters Vacant Land Summary	47
Table 41 Residential Projects Completed Since Start of Current Regional Housing Needs Plan Period.....	50
Table 42 Summary of Undeveloped and Under-Developed Land by Parcel Size.....	51
Table 43 Land and Existing Structure Costs	Error! Bookmark not defined.
Table 44 Monthly Payment and Total Interest at Various Interest Rates	54
Table 45 City of Winters Residential Zoning Requirements with Allowable Residential Development	58
Table 46 Building Permit and Development Impact Fees	61
Table 47 Multit-Family Development Building Permit and Development Fees	62
Table 48 Planning Fees	63
Table 49 Application Processing Times	65
Table 50 Residential Parking Requirements	71

INTRODUCTION

The Housing Needs Assessment analyzes population and housing characteristics, identifies special housing needs among certain population groups, evaluates housing conditions, and provides other important information to support the goals, policies, and programs to meet the needs of current and future Winters' residents. The United States Census, completed every ten years, is an important source of information for the Housing Needs Assessment. Results from the 2000 Census have been incorporated into the needs assessment. The data presented in the Housing Needs Assessment will not only guide the development of housing goals and policies, but will also be integrated into the body of the Housing Element to present the current status of housing and housing related issues in the City of Winters.

The needs assessment is organized into four data sections. The first section focuses on demographic information, such as population trends, ethnicity, age, household composition, income, employment, housing characteristics, general housing needs by income, and housing needs for specialized segments of the population. This first section outlines the characteristics of the community, and identifies those characteristics that may have significant impacts on housing needs in the community.

The second section identifies the City's resources, the historic development patterns, and housing opportunities in the community. It also discusses the City's existing housing stock and the potential areas for future housing development.

The next section discusses the governmental and non-governmental constraints to housing development in Winters. The City has planning, zoning, and building standards that guide and affect residential development patterns and that influence housing availability and affordability. In addition, there are environmental and housing market conditions that affect the location, availability, affordability, and type of housing that is constructed in Winters. The "non-governmental" influences include such factors as the availability and cost of financing, land, and materials for building homes; natural conditions that affect the cost of preparing and developing land for housing; and the business decisions of individuals and organizations in home building, finance, real estate, and rental housing that impact housing cost and availability.

The final section of the Needs Assessment discusses opportunities for energy conservation, which can reduce costs to homeowners and infrastructure costs to the City. With a reduction in basic living costs through energy savings, more households will be better able to afford adequate housing.

FINDINGS

The following is a summary of findings from this Housing Needs Assessment Report.

Population Trends

- Winters' population is expected to grow steadily over the next 20 years, continuing the demand for a variety of housing types and costs. The Sacramento Area Council of Governments (SACOG) projects that the City of Winters will experience a 57 percent growth rate between 2000 and 2010. By comparison, the growth rate in Winters between 1990 and 2000 was 32 percent.
- Winters' ethnic composition in 2000 was primarily Non-Hispanic White (51 percent) and Hispanic or Latino (44 percent). Between 1990 and 2000, the percentage of Non-Hispanic Whites decreased by 6 percent, while the percentage of Hispanics or Latinos increased by 4 percent.
- The City of Winters has a slightly higher percentage of persons under 18 and a slightly lower percentage of persons 65 years and over than the countywide and statewide averages. Family households represented 81 percent of all households in Winters in 2000, compared to 63 percent countywide. Of the City's family households, the majority have children.

Income and Poverty

- Residents of Winters and Yolo County have similar income characteristics. The median income level in Winters increased by 55 percent between 1990 and 2000, from \$31,381 to \$48,678, based on the 1990 and 2000 U.S. Census. The median income level in Yolo County increased by 41 percent between 1990 and 2000, from \$28,866 to \$40,769.
- According to the 2000 Census, the poverty rate in Winters was 5 percent. Female-headed households with children had relatively higher poverty rates at 18 percent. Residents 65 years of age or older had relatively lower poverty rates at 6 percent.

Employment Trends

- Employment data from the U.S. Census and the California Employment Development Department (EDD) suggest that the majority of Winters' residents are employed in occupations related to service/retail, administrative/managerial, and agriculture.
- Over the next five years, new employment is forecasted to be concentrated in retail and service industries, light manufacturing, and distribution fields. Many of these jobs will pay wages or salaries in the low- to moderate-income level for single-wage earner households. This employment growth will contribute to a continuing need for additional affordable housing for such income groups.

Special Needs

- As the current population ages over the next 20 years, Winters will experience an increase in the number of older adults with special housing needs. Persons age 65 and over represented 8 percent of Winters' total population in 2000, and experienced a 15 percent increase in

population between 1990 and 2000. However, between 1990 and 2000, the population represented by persons age 55 and over declined by 4 percent.

- The housing needs among older adults in Winters are: 1) financial support for low-income seniors who do not own their homes; 2) financial assistance for home maintenance and repairs among low-income senior homeowners; 3) assisted care living facilities for those who have self-care and mobility limitations; 4) affordable independent living rental housing; and 5) financial assistance for home modifications for those with minor self-care or mobility concerns.
- Non-elderly individuals with disabilities also have financial and physical needs. Although the number of such individuals represents a small percentage of all residents, their needs frequently remain unmet by the private market.
- Female-headed households represent 22 percent of all households in Winters, and of these households 159, or 65 percent, were female-headed households with minor children. The 2000 Census states that there were 31 female-headed householders below the poverty level (all of whom had related children less than 18 years of age). Many female-headed householders have extremely low incomes and will continue to require significant financial assistance or subsidized rental housing. Single mothers with minor children face additional challenges in finding affordable family housing of suitable size.
- According to the 2000 Census, large family households (defined as family households with five or more persons) in Winters represent approximately 23.5 percent of all households. Of the large family households, 30.1-percent are renters and have the greatest unmet housing needs due to high rates of overcrowding and overpayment.
- According to the Winters Housing Authority, there is not an immediate need for emergency shelters and/or transitional housing in Winters; however, if the need were to arise, the City of Winters' Zoning Code permits emergency shelters, through a conditional use permit process, in the Medium High Density Residential (R-3), High Density Residential (R-4), Central Business (C-2), and Public/Quasi-Public (PQP) districts. As part of the 2002 Housing Element update, the City will be amending its Zoning Code to allow transitional housing, through a conditional use permit process, in the Medium High Density Residential (R-3) and High Density Residential (R-4) districts.

Housing Characteristics

- The majority of the City's housing stock consists of single-family detached homes (80 percent). According to the 2000 Census, the percentage of persons who own their own home is higher in Winters (69 percent) than countywide (53 percent).
- Homeownership in the City is highest among persons age 75 and older (82 percent). In 2000, persons of Hispanic or Latino origin comprised 44.4 percent of the population and represented 43.1 percent of owner occupied units.
- Based on an informal housing conditions survey conducted by the City in March 2002, the City estimates that 5 percent (90 units) of its housing units are in need of moderate rehabilitation and 1 percent (20 units) are in need of replacement.

- Of the City's occupied housing units, approximately 13 percent were overcrowded, compared to 10 percent countywide. This represents a higher rate of overcrowding in the City of Winters than in Yolo County. Overcrowding occurred more often in rental housing (20 percent) than owner-occupied housing (9 percent).

Housing Costs and Affordability

- In 2000, 22 percent of all rental housing in Winters was affordable to very low-income households, and 59 percent was affordable to low-income households. Currently, three apartment complexes in the City have rental subsidies, including one senior-restricted complex with 38 units.
- In January 2002, the median price for resale homes in Winters was \$259,000; slightly higher than in the neighboring communities of Dixon and Woodland (\$5,000 to \$40,000), but lower than in the communities of Davis and Vacaville (\$30,000 to \$240,000).
- Of new homes for sale in Winters in March 2002, the majority was priced in the mid- to high-\$200,000s range, with some homes available in the low- to mid-\$300,000s range. Home sizes ranged from three-bedroom, two-bathroom homes of approximately 1,600 square feet to four-bedroom, three-bathroom homes of 2,300 square feet.
- Even with Winters' relatively lower housing prices in the region, few very low- or low-income households can afford to own a home in the City without financial assistance. Based on the total resale homes in 2001, none of the homes were affordable to very low- or low-income households and just under half were affordable to moderate-income households. Generally, only households with incomes above the countywide median income can afford to purchase a new home in Winters.

Opportunities and Constraints

- SACOG has determined that Winters has a housing construction need of 772 units for the planning period 2000-2007. Of the total 772 units, 25 percent should be affordable to very low-income households, 16 percent to low-income households, 15 percent to moderate-income households, and 44 percent to above moderate-income households. Very low- and low-income housing needs represent 313 housing units of the City's total housing allocation.
- The City's vacant land within residentially zoned land (on sites zoned either R-3 or R-4) at densities potentially affordable to low- or very low-income households can accommodate up to 604 new dwelling units based on maximum zoning densities of 10 dwelling units/acre for R-3 and 20 dwelling units/acre for R-4. With the City's existing vacant land zoned for higher densities, Winters will be able to accommodate its regional allocation share for very low- and low-income households.
- Winters' zoning regulations and development permit processes do not create unreasonable restrictions to the City's ability to accommodate affordable housing. The City permits a range of residential densities that should be sufficient to accommodate all income groups.
- The time required in the City of Winters for development approval is not generally a constraint or substantial cost to housing developers.

HOUSING NEEDS AND OPPORTUNITIES

DEVELOPMENT HISTORY

The City of Winters is a modestly growing farming community approximately 35 miles west of Sacramento. The City's history is integrally tied to agriculture and related industries that dominated (and to some extent, still dominate) western Sacramento, Yolo, and northern Solano counties. Its character is closely linked to its location in a rich agricultural area at the foot of the Napa Mountains and to its location along a major interstate travel route. Today, Winters is located within an area that still contains many active farms and agricultural operations, which have historically affected population trends in the City.

Most of the City's development has occurred within the past 20 years. This growth and change has affected the City's character as well as population size. In earlier decades, much of the population, lifestyle, and employment were related to the production and transportation of agriculture and agricultural goods. During the past 10 to 20 years, residential growth and development in Winters has been tied to the suburban expansion of Sacramento, Yolo, and Solano counties. New arrivals have come looking for affordable single-family homes within reasonable commutes to employment centers in the surrounding counties.

Housing in Winters is characterized primarily by single-family homes. With market conditions favoring single-family home construction, homebuilders in the community have preferred to serve the single-family home market.

POPULATION CHARACTERISTICS

Population Trends

The growth rate in Winters between 1990 and 2000 was 32 percent, slightly higher than Yolo County's growth rate of 20 percent (Table 1). Much of the population growth experienced by Winters during the past 20 years has been due to its convenient location along Interstate 505, low development costs, and a desire by many residents to enjoy single-family home ownership in a smaller community setting. Population growth and change in Winters has also been affected in the past by changes in the agricultural economy and agricultural employment trends.

Table 1

Winters Population Growth

	1990	2000	Percent Change
City	4,639	6,125	32%
County	141,092	168,660	20%

Source: 1990 and 2000 Census.

Table 2 provides population growth information for the City of Winters and Yolo County between 1990 and 2020. SACOG has projected a 42 percent growth rate increase for Winters between 2000 and 2010, and a 44 percent increase between 2010 and 2020. In Yolo County, SACOG has projected a 24 percent growth rate increase between 2000 and 2010, and a 19 percent growth rate increase between 2010 and 2020. According to SACOG projections, the City of Winters is expected to reach a population of approximately 12,500 by 2020.

The number of households in Winters increased from 1,506 in 1990 to 1,907 in 2000 (27 percent increase). SACOG projects a 50 percent increase in households in Winters by 2010 and a 44 percent increase between 2010 and 2020.

The number of persons per household in Winters increased from 3.08 in 1990 to 3.21 in 2000. SACOG projects a slight decline in the number of persons per household in the City by 2020 to 3.01. In comparison, Yolo County had fewer persons per household in 1990 and 2000 than did Winters. Projections for Yolo County see a decrease from 2.71 persons per household in 2000 to 2.68 in 2020.

Table 2

Winters and Yolo County Population Growth 1990-2020

	1990 ¹	2000 ¹	2010 ²	2020 ²
Population				
Winters	4,639	6,125	8,710	12,515
Yolo County	141,092	168,660	209,035	247,905
Households				
Winters	1,506	1,907	2,865	4,131
Yolo County	50,972	59,375	75,555	90,380
Persons per Household				
Winters	3.08	3.21	3.03	3.01
Yolo County	2.63	2.71	2.68	2.68

Source: 1990 and 2000 Census and SACOG Projections 2001.

¹1990 and 2000 Census.

²SACOG 2001 Projections.

Ethnicity

An analysis of Winters' population between 1990 and 2000 shows the number of Whites decreased by 6 percent, while the number of Hispanics or Latinos increased by 4 percent (Table 3). All other racial and ethnic groups remained small percentages of the City's overall population.

Table 3

Comparison of Race by City, County, and State Population

Race	Winters 1990	Winters 2000	Yolo County 2000	California 2000
Non-Hispanic White	57%	51%	58%	47%
Black	<1%	<1%	2%	6%
Native American	1%	<1%	<1%	1%
Asian/Pacific Islander	1%	1%	10%	11%
Other Race	<1%	<1%	<1%	<1%
Two or More Races ¹	--	2%	3%	3%
Hispanic or Latino	40%	44%	26%	32%

Source: 1990 and 2000 Census.

¹This is a 2000 Census category only.

Age of Population

A comparison of the ages among the City, County, and State populations shows general similarities (Table 4). Overall, the City of Winters has an older population than the County and a younger population than the State. Individuals under 20 years of age comprised 37 percent of the City's population in 2000, compared to 32 percent for the County and 30 percent statewide. Conversely, only 14 percent of Winters' residents were over 55 in 2000, compared to 15 percent in the County and 19 percent statewide. The larger percentage of minors in Winters is consistent with the higher percentage of families with children (see Table 6, page 9).

Table 4

Age Distribution (2000)

Age	Winters	Yolo County	California
Under 5 years	8%	7%	7%
5 to 19 years	29%	25%	23%
20 to 34 years	19%	26%	22%
35 to 54 years	30%	26%	29%
55 to 64 years	7%	7%	8%
65 and over	7%	9%	11%
Median age	31	30	33

Source: 2000 Census.

Household Type and Composition

Further insight into the characteristics of the City's population can be gained by examining household composition, such as the proportion of families with children, single adults, and single parents.

Winters' population increased slightly faster than the number of households during the 1990s due to increasing household sizes. While the population increased in the decade by 32 percent, the number of households increased by only 27 percent, from 1,506 to 1,907. Of the 1,907 households in 2000, Table 5 shows that the highest percentage consisted of two-person households (25.7 percent). The next largest percentage was four-person households (22 percent). The highest percentage of households in Yolo County consisted of two-person households (31.8 percent) followed by one-person households (23.3 percent). The City of Winters also had a higher percentage of households with four to six persons (37.6 percent) than the County (25.5 percent).

Table 5

Number of Persons per Household (2000)

	Winters 2000	Yolo County 2000
1 Person	276	13,829
2 Persons	491	18,883
3 Persons	355	10,184
4 Persons	420	9095
5 Persons	212	4229
6 Persons	85	1819
7+ Persons	68	1336

Source: 2000 Census.

In addition to household size, household composition provides important indicators of population characteristics and trends (Table 6). The 2000 Census reported that 81 percent of all households in Winters were family households. Over half of the families (64 percent) were married-couple households. Compared to the countywide population, Winters has a substantially higher percentage of family households and families with children. Although most people in Winters lived in family households, 19 percent of the households were comprised of non-family residents. The non-family households were primarily single adults (including seniors). In comparison, the 2000 Census reported 63 percent of all households in the County to be family households and of those, 48 percent were married-couple households.

Table 6

Household Composition by Type (2000)

Household Type	Number of Households		Percent of Households	
	City	County	City	County
Family Households	1,547	37,468	81%	63%
Married Couple Family Households	1,222	28,275	64%	48%
With Children	725	14,503		
Without Children	497	13,772		
Female Householder, no husband present	244	6,580	13%	11%
With Children	159	4,072		
Without Children	85	2,509		
Non-family Households	360	21,907	19%	37%
Living Alone	276	13,829	15%	23%
Householders 65 and over	121	4,352		
Householders under 65	155	9,477		
Others	84	8,078	5%	22%
Total Households	1,907	59,375	100%	100%
Group Quarters (Persons)				
Institutionalized persons	6	1,235	100%	16%
Other persons in group quarters	0	6,280	0%	84%
Total Persons in Group Quarters	6	7,515	100%	100%

Source: 2000 Census.

INCOME CHARACTERISTICS

Table 7 shows that the median income level in Winters increased by 55 percent between 1990 and 2000, from \$31,381 to \$48,678, based on 1990 and 2000 U.S. Census data. Yolo County's median income level increased by 41 percent between 1990 and 2000, from \$28,866 to \$40,769.

Table 7

Median Incomes in Winters and Yolo County (2000)

	Winters	Yolo County
Median Household Income	\$48,678	\$40,769
Median Family Income	\$55,183	\$51,623
Median Non-Family Income	\$17,133	\$19,365

Source: 2000 Census.

Table 8 shows that in 1990, a little over 4 percent of Winters' households had incomes above \$75,000, compared to 26 percent in 2000. Conversely, 32 percent of the City's households had incomes below \$25,000 in 1990 and 21 percent had incomes below \$25,000 in 2000.

Table 8

Household Income (1990 and 2000)

Income	1990 Percent of Total Households in Winters	2000 Percent of Total Households in Winters
Under \$14,999	17%	11%
\$15,000 to \$24,999	15%	10%
\$25,000 to \$34,999	24%	10%
\$35,000 to \$49,999	21%	20%
\$50,000 to \$74,999	16%	23%
\$75,000 – \$99,999	4%	15%
\$100,000 – \$149,999	<1%	8%
\$150,000 or more	<1%	3%

Source: 1990 and 2000 Census.

Four income categories are typically used for comparative purposes that are based on a percentage of the county median income and adjusted for household size (Table 9). These categories are referred to as “very low-income,” “low-income,” “moderate-income,” and “above moderate-income.” The median income on which these four categories are based represents the mid-point at which half of the households earn more and half earn less. In a normally distributed population (that is, one not skewed to either end of the income scale), approximately 40 percent of the population will have income within the very low- and low-income ranges, about 20 percent within the moderate-income range, and about 40 percent in the above moderate-income range.

Table 9

Definitions Used for Comparing Income Levels

Income Definitions	
Very Low-Income	50 percent of the Yolo County Median Income or below
Low-Income	51 to 80 percent of the Yolo County Median Income
Moderate-Income	81 to 120 percent of the Yolo County Median Income
Above Moderate-Income	121 percent of the Yolo County Median Income and above

Source: HUD Income Limits, 2002.

Table 10 provides the percentages of Yolo County and Winters residents that are within these income ranges. Both Yolo County and Winters are within a few percentage points of a normally distributed population. However, as expected, Yolo County is closer to a normally distributed population than Winters because of its much larger population—about 44 percent of the population

countywide is within the very low- and low-income ranges, 16 percent within the moderate-income range, and 40 percent in the above moderate-income range. Winters' households are comprised of 31 percent very low- and low-income, and 49 percent above-moderate income.

Table 10

City of Winters and Yolo County
Household Income Range by Income Category (2000)

Income Category	2000 Income Range	Winters Percent of Households in 2000 (approximately)	Yolo County Percent of Households in 2000 (approximately)
Very Low-Income	\$0-\$20,384	21%	32%
Low-Income	\$20,385-\$32,615	10%	12%
Moderate-Income	\$32,616-\$48,922	20%	16%
Above Moderate-Income	\$48,923-+	49%	40%
1990 Winters Median Income: \$31,381		1990 Yolo County Median Income: \$28,866	
2000 Winters Median Income: \$48,678		2000 Yolo County Median Income: \$40,769	

Source: 1990 and 2000 Census.

Another measure of changes in estimated income is the annual release of income limits prepared by the Federal Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) and adopted by the State of California for determining eligibility for various housing programs. These limits define the dollar amount of each of the four income levels discussed previously (very low, low, moderate, and above moderate) based on a percentage of the estimated median income for the county in which the jurisdiction is located. Although these income limits are not based on actual surveys of local incomes, the annual changes can show trends in estimated changes among different regions of the State. Table 11 provides limits for Yolo County for 2004. According to HUD, the estimated 2004 median income for a family of four is \$60,200 in the County.

Table 11**Yolo County Income Limits (2004)**

Household Size	Extremely Low-Income (30% of Median)	Very Low-Income (50% of Median)	Low-Income (80% of Median)
1 Person	\$12,650	\$21,050	\$33,700
2 Persons	\$14,450	\$24,100	\$38,550
3 Persons	\$16,250	\$27,100	\$43,350
4 Persons	\$18,050	\$30,100	\$48,150
5 Persons	\$19,500	\$32,500	\$52,000
6 Persons	\$20,950	\$34,900	\$55,850
7 Persons	\$22,400	\$37,300	\$59,700
8 Persons	\$23,850	\$39,750	\$63,550

Source: HUD, 2004.

Poverty

The poverty level of income is a federally defined measure of the minimum income needed for subsistence living. The poverty level is an important indicator of severe financial distress, and the rate of poverty in a community (proportion of the population with poverty level incomes or less) provides important information about individuals and families in the greatest financial need. The dollar threshold for poverty is adjusted each year by the federal government for household size and composition. Table 12 provides 2001 poverty thresholds for several types of households.

Table 12**Poverty Thresholds (2001)**

Single Person 65+	\$8,259	Two Adults, One Child	\$13,861
Single Person Under 65	\$8,959	One Adult, Three Children	\$17,524
Two Persons 65+	\$10,409	Two Adults, Two Children	\$17,463
Two Persons Under 65	\$11,531	One Adult, Four Children	\$20,236
One Adult, Two Children	\$13,874	Two Adults, Three Children	\$20,550

Source: Census Bureau, 2001.

The 2000 Census shows that 5 percent of the City's population had incomes below the federally defined poverty level; this is 6 percent less than the 1990 Census reported. By comparison, approximately 18 percent of the County's population was below the poverty level (1 percent less than reported in the 1990 Census). There were 31 (18 percent) female-headed households with children under 18 in 2000, compared to the 44 female-headed households reported in the 1990 Census. In 2000, 5 percent, 204 persons 18 years and over, were below the poverty level representing a decrease of 4 percent since 1990. The 2000 Census indicated that persons 65 years and over had a 6 percent poverty rate (4 percent lower than the 1990 Census).

Poverty rates listed in Table 13 are based on persons for whom the poverty status is determined and does not reflect persons who live in group quarters, therefore this report does not reflect 100 percent of the population. The following statistics on poverty rates are based on 2000 US Census poverty information.

Table 13

Winters Poverty Rates¹ (2000)

Group	Above Poverty Level	Below Poverty Level	Poverty Rate
65 and Over	461	29	5.9%
Under 65	5615	276	4.7%
Under 18	1966	101	4.9%
18-64	3373	175	4.9%
Female Headed Households With Related Children Under 18	139	31	18.2%
Married Couple Families	1198	24	2.0%
Black	--	--	--
Native American	--	--	--
Asian	--	--	--
Hispanic or Latino	2588	100	3.7%
White	3901	245	5.9%

Source: 2000 Census.

¹Data for Black, Native American, and Asian households is not available from Census 2000 as the result from each of the groups is below the minimum threshold of 100.

EMPLOYMENT TRENDS

Area Employment Profile

According to the 2000 Census there were 2,728 persons 16 years and older in the labor force. Six different occupations employed the majority of the labor force. These consisted of executive, management, professional, and related occupations (27 percent), sales and office occupations (22 percent), production, transportation, and material moving occupations (17 percent), service occupations (14 percent), construction, extraction, and maintenance occupations (11 percent), and farming, forestry, and fishing occupations (9 percent).

Table 14 lists major employers throughout the City of Winters. Most of the top employers are public agencies, manufacturers, retail/service establishments, or distribution companies. The United States Department of Labor determined that the average annual pay in Winters and Yolo County for 1999/2000 was \$32,362 and \$33,395 respectively.

Table 14**Major Employers in the City of Winters**

Company	Employees
Mariani Nut Company	200 – 500 (seasonal)
Winters Joint Unified School District	232
Buckhorn Restaurant	52
City of Winters	26

Source: City of Winters, March 2002.

Over the next five years, the City expects new employment to be concentrated in retail and service industries, light manufacturing, distribution, and public agencies. Many of these jobs will pay wages or salaries in the low- to moderate-income level.

Employment Projections

The California Employment Development Department produces an annual Occupational Employment and Wage Data estimate by metropolitan statistical area (MSA). For the year 2001, a sample of jobs and salaries was taken relating to projected job growth in Yolo County. Table 15 lists the mean annual wage, and the 25th and 75th percentile annual wage of the working force for each job category. Occupations listed are in the areas of retail sales, service, laborers, and general office personnel. Three-fourths of the occupations listed have mean annual wages in the low- and moderate-income ranges as defined in Table 10.

Table 15**Occupational Employment and Wage Data for Yolo County (2001)**

Occupational Title	Employment Estimates	Mean Annual Wage	25th Percentile Annual Wage	75th Percentile Annual Wage
Teachers (Preschool School)	160	\$38,284	*	*
Teachers (Elementary School)	880	\$44,614	*	*
Receptionists and Information Clerks	1,360	\$22,163	\$16,723	\$26,561
Customer Service Reps	590	\$29,179	\$20,467	\$37,315
General Operations Manager	950	\$74,084	\$48,526	\$93,267
Maintenance Repair Workers	770	\$33,520	\$22,900	\$42,411
Social Workers, Medical and Psychiatric	20	\$43,523	\$38,667	\$51,043
Registered Nurses	440	\$48,114	\$42,120	\$54,475
Pharmacists	80	\$80,812	\$78,291	\$89,835
Janitors and Cleaners	1,100	\$18,125	\$13,104	\$21,361
Child Care Workers	500	\$18,854	\$15,392	\$21,715
Cashiers	1,720	\$17,761	\$13,291	\$18,512
Bus Drivers, School	70	\$22,333	\$20,467	\$23,608
Truck Drivers, Heavy and Tractor Trailer	470	\$30,674	\$23,857	\$38,771
Packers and Packagers	740	\$24,035	\$30,908	\$32,240
Technical Assistants, Library	40	\$28,555	\$21,424	\$30,035
Urban and Regional Planners	70	\$40,487	\$36,816	\$45,489

Source: EDD, 2001.

* For some occupations, workers may not work full-time year-round. For these occupations, it is not feasible to calculate an hourly wage.

Table 16 provides EDD employment projections between 1997 and 2004 for Yolo County. The occupations listed in Table 16 have the greatest absolute job growth potential, as determined by EDD. Over the next five years, the City of Winters expects new employment to be concentrated in retail and service industries, light manufacturing, and distribution fields. Many of these jobs will pay wages in the low- and moderate-income ranges.

Table 16**Yolo County Employment Projections as Related to Job Growth (1997 – 2004)**

Occupation	Annual Averages		Absolute Change (Number of Jobs)	Percent Change
	1997	2004		
Cashiers	1,220	1,610	390	32%
General Operations Managers	1,500	1,850	350	23%
Salespersons, Retail	1,530	1,870	340	22%
Customer Service Reps	50	350	300	600%
Truck Drivers, Heavy	1,920	2,200	280	15%
Traffic, Shipping, Receiving Clerks	1,450	1,700	250	17%
General Office Clerks	2,520	2,760	240	10%
Receptionists, Information Clerks	550	780	230	42%
Hand Packers and Packers	910	1,130	220	24%
Teacher Aides and Assistants	620	830	210	34%
Maintenance Repair Workers	950	1,160	210	22%
Truck Drivers, Light	1,180	1,380	200	17%
Stock Clerks, Warehouse	750	940	190	25%
Child Care Workers	390	580	190	49%
Janitors, Cleaners	1,620	1,800	180	11%

Source: EDD, 2001.

SPECIAL HOUSING NEEDS**Persons 65 and Over**

Persons over 65 face special housing challenges related to physical and financial conditions. Often times, older adults face declining mobility and self-care capabilities that create special housing needs and challenges for them. Many older adults, even those owning their own homes, face financial challenges due to limited incomes from Social Security and other retirement benefits. Data on the incomes and housing expenses of householders 65 and older indicate that a substantial number (although by no means the majority) of these older adults may need assistance related to:

- repair and maintenance of owned dwellings units;
- modifications to existing homes to better meet mobility and self-care limitations;
- financial assistance to meet rising rental housing costs for those who do not own; and
- supportive services to meet daily needs, such as those provided at assisted care residences.

Table 17 compares the number of older adults in 1990 and 2000. The population age 65 and over has increased more slowly than the total population, as has the population 55 years of age or more.

However, the total number of older adults in Winters continues to increase, so the housing needs of seniors will continue to be a significant aspect of total housing needs in the City.

In 2000, the population represented by persons 55 years of age or more was 11 percent of the total population, while persons 65 years of age or more represented 8 percent. Between 1990 and 2000, Winters experienced a 4 percent decrease in the population 55 years of age or more, and a 15 percent increase in the population 65 years of age or more.

Table 17**Pattern of Aging of the Winters Population**

	1990	2000	Percent Change
Total Population	4,739	6,125	32%
Population 55+	708	684	-4%
Population 65+	415	477	15%

Source: 1990 and 2000 Census.

In 2000, the incidence of poverty among the population in Winters over 65 years of age was 5.9 percent; this compares favorably with the 10 percent rate in 1990. Persons age 18 to 64 had a poverty rate of 4.9 percent; the rate in 1990 was 9 percent. These percentages show that, as a group, persons age 65 and over in Winters are not adversely affected by poverty any more than the population aged 18 to 64. It is not unusual for seniors to have low poverty rates, even though a large percentage may be low-income, due to Social Security and other retirement benefits that provide a guaranteed minimum income.

Tenure is also important when analyzing the needs of seniors. Older adults typically have the highest rates of homeownership of any age group, and Winters' senior homeowner population is above the population as a whole. In Winters, the proportion of seniors living in owner-occupied housing was 76.2 percent in 2000, compared to 68.9 percent for the total population. Although seniors represent about 7.8 percent of the population, they comprise 18 percent of all homeowners.

One common special need for a growing portion of the population age 65 and over is for assisted living facilities that combine meal, medical, and daily living assistance in a residential environment. One State Department of Social Services licensed care facility was identified as providing services in Winters to residents age 65 and over. Our Lady of Perpetual Help offers assisted living services in a residential home setting with a capacity of eight persons. Having only one assisted living facility in Winters may be insufficient to meet the future needs of seniors with mobility and self-care limitations. As current seniors and near-seniors living in Winters age, their physical needs and capacities will change, and the need for daily living assistance will increase.

Mobility and Self-Care Limitations

Less than 19 percent of the City's non-institutionalized residents have physical conditions that affect their abilities to live independently in conventional residential settings according to the Census Bureau. These individuals have mobility impairments, self-care limitations, or other conditions that may require special housing accommodations or financial assistance. Such individuals can have a number of special needs that distinguish them from the population at large.

- Individuals with mobility difficulties (such as those confined to wheelchairs) may require special accommodations or modifications to their homes to allow for continued independent living. Such modifications are often called “handicapped access.”
- Individuals with self-care limitations (which can include persons with mobility difficulties) may require residential environments that include in-home or on-site support services, ranging from congregate to convalescent care. Support services can include medical therapy, daily living assistance, congregate dining, and related services.
- Individuals with developmental disabilities and other physical and mental conditions that prevent them from functioning independently may require assisted care or group home environments.
- Individuals with disabilities may require financial assistance to meet their housing needs because typically a higher percentage are low-income than the population at large and their special housing needs are often more costly than conventional housing.

Some people with mobility and/or self-care limitations are able to live with their families, who can assist in meeting housing and daily living needs. A segment of the disabled population, particularly low-income and retired individuals, may not have the financial capacity to pay for needed accommodations or modifications to their homes. In addition, even those able to pay for special housing accommodations may find them unavailable in the City.

Disabled persons often require special housing features to accommodate physical limitations. Some disabled persons may experience financial difficulty in locating suitable housing due to the cost of modifications to meet their daily living needs or may have difficulty in finding appropriate housing near places of employment. Although the California Administrative Code (Title 24) requires that all public buildings be accessible to the public through architectural standards such as ramps, large doors, and restroom modifications to enable handicap access, not all available housing units have these features. In addition, there are other types of physical and design modifications that may be necessary to accommodate various types of disabilities.

According to the 2000 Census, 699 (21 percent) persons between the ages of 21 and 64 had mobility and/or self-care limitations in Winters that might require special housing accommodations and supportive services.

Families with Female Heads of Households

Most female-headed households are either single, women over the age of 65, or single females with minor children (mothers or other female relatives). Traditionally, these three groups have been considered special needs groups because their incomes tend to be lower, making it difficult to obtain affordable housing, or because they have specific physical needs related to housing (such as child care or assisted living support for older adults). Single mothers, in particular, tend to have difficulty in obtaining suitable, affordable housing. Such households also have a greater need for housing with convenient access to child-care facilities, public transportation, and other public facilities and services.

Of the 1,907 households in the City in 2000, 244 were female-headed households, or 22 percent of the total households in Winters. Of the female-headed households, 159, or 65 percent, were female-headed households with minor children. The 2000 Census states that there were 31 female-headed householders below the poverty level (all of whom had related children less than 18 years of age). It may be assumed that most of these households are overpaying for housing (i.e. more than 30 percent of their income), or are experiencing other unmet housing needs. As a result of poverty, female

heads of households often spend more on immediate needs such as food, clothing, transportation, and medical care, than on home maintenance, which results in living units falling into disrepair.

Large Families

Large families (usually defined as family households with five or more persons) can have difficulty securing adequate housing due to the need for a larger number of bedrooms (three or more) to avoid overcrowding. Overcrowding is typically defined as more than one person per room, excluding uninhabitable space such as bathrooms and hallways. Low-income large families typically need financial assistance in Yolo County to secure affordable housing that meets their space needs. It becomes even more difficult when large families try to find adequate rentals within their budget because rentals typically have fewer bedrooms than ownership housing. As a result, large families tend to have higher rates of overcrowding and overpaying for housing (housing costs that exceed 30 percent of a household's income). Many large families are also composed of immigrants and/or minorities who may face additional housing challenges due to discrimination and/or limited language proficiency.

In 2000, 19.1 percent of all households in Winters had five or more persons, somewhat higher than the proportion of large families countywide (7.1 percent). Of the total occupied housing units in Winters, 255 were owner-occupied households of five or more persons and 110 were renter-occupied households of five or more persons. It is likely that the 110 large family renter households have the greatest needs related to housing availability and affordability.

Farmworkers

Specific data on the number of farmworkers in a community is not systematically collected, as a result it is difficult to assess the precise needs of this group. According to the 2000 Census, 9 percent (245 persons) of the City's total labor force were employed in farming, forestry, and fishing occupations. Due to the predominance of agricultural production in Yolo County, it is possible that a significant number of farmworkers live in Winters and work in other areas of the region.

Farmworkers tend to have lower incomes due to their lower-paying nature of work. Farmworkers who are permanent residents of Winters, particularly those who are part of large family households, face many of the same difficulties in obtaining suitable, affordable housing as other low-income families. Sound, affordable housing of sufficient size is a high priority need among farmworker households. Based on information provided by Yolo County social service organizations, there appears to be a shortage of affordable housing available to residents of Winters who are employed in agricultural work. This makes it very difficult for farmworker households to compete for the limited supply of lower-income housing in Winters.

To address the regional needs of the migrant farmworker community, the Yolo County Housing Authority operates three state-owned migrant farmworker facilities: Madison, Dixon, and Davis Migrant Housing centers. The Madison Migrant Housing Center is located in the community of Madison, about 11 miles west of Woodland, and can accommodate up to 88 families during the agricultural season (early April to late October). The Dixon Migrant Housing Center is located on Radio Station Road, approximately four miles from downtown Dixon and can accommodate up to 82 families. The Davis Migrant Housing Center is located approximately 6 miles south of Davis in Solano County and can accommodate up to 62 families.

The City of Winters will, as part of the policies for the 2002 Housing Element update, amend the Zoning Ordinance to allow farmworker housing in the Medium High Density (R-3) Residential, High Density (R-4) Residential districts through a conditional use permit process. The conditional use permit process is described in Section 8-1.4205 of the City's Zoning Ordinance and under the Governmental Constraints section of this Housing Needs Assessment Report.

Homeless

The housing needs of homeless persons are more difficult to measure and assess than those of any other population subgroup. Since these individuals have no permanent addresses, they are not likely to be counted in the Census. They are also unlikely to have stable employment, which makes housing opportunities limited.

Nonetheless, homelessness in Yolo County is addressed on a countywide basis. Anecdotal information from County social service organizations indicates there is not a great need in Winters for emergency shelters and/or transitional housing because of the low incidence of homelessness. If the need were to arise, however, Winters permits emergency homeless shelters in the Medium High Density Residential (R-3), High Density Residential (R-4), Central Business (C-2), and Public/Quasi-Public (PQP) districts through a conditional use permit process. The City of Winters' Zoning Ordinance does not currently specify where transitional housing is permitted in the City. The City of Winters will, as part of the policies for the 2002 Housing Element update, amend the Zoning Ordinance to allow transitional housing in the Medium High Density (R-3) Residential, High Density (R-4) Residential districts through a conditional use permit process. The conditional use permit process is described in Section 8-1.4205 of the City's Zoning Ordinance and under the Governmental Constraints section of this Housing Needs Assessment Report.

Agencies Offering Public Assistance to Homeless and Other Special Needs Groups

There are several public service organizations and agencies in the Yolo County area that offer shelter, counseling, or other services for the homeless, abused, and elderly.

Winters Housing Complex, (a Yolo County Housing Authority facility), which is located at 62 Myrtle Drive, adjacent to Winters in Yolo County, provides subsidized housing opportunities for families, the elderly, or disabled persons through administering year-round housing programs. Very low-income households of two or more persons, single people who are age 62 or older, and handicapped and/or permanently disabled individuals are eligible for the programs. Preference is given to those who live and work in Yolo County, veterans, and persons who have become displaced because of poor housing conditions. According to the Housing Authority, there is a 1½- to 2½-year waiting list for these permanent housing programs.

Winters Senior Center, located at 201 Railroad Avenue (Winters Community Center), Winters, offers elderly-nutrition lunch programs, monthly potluck meetings, speakers on senior issues, and senior recreation activities. The City provides a medical appointments transportation service for senior citizens; the vehicle used for the service is not wheelchair accessible.

Yolo Wayfarer Center, located at 201 Forth Street, Woodland, offers a variety of social services and programs that include, but are not limited to the following.

- A dinner meal Monday through Friday, 5:30 to 6 p.m., and Saturday and Sunday, 3 to 3:30 p.m.

- Cold Weather Shelter, mid-November through February/March, daily from 7 p.m. to 7 a.m. with shower facilities available.
- Grocery distribution every Monday, Wednesday, and Friday at 10 a.m.
- Afternoon services including lunch Monday through Friday, 1 to 4 p.m., and shower and laundry facilities, 12:30 to 1 p.m.
- YoloBus passes for appointments with the Center.
- Family Transitional Housing/Family Recovery Program: A transitional housing program for low-income homeless one- or two-parent families with minor children. These families are sheltered in individual apartments and/or houses and participate in a program plan for correcting the homeless situation.
- Aftercare for individuals who are moving from homelessness to independence.
- Financial vouchers by appointment based on need.
- Singles Transitional Housing Shelter: Offers programs for the housing of single adults in a group living environment.
- Holiday food baskets for families.

People Resources, Inc., located at 70 North East Street, Suite C, Woodland, offers seniors age 60 and older meal services Monday through Friday at six different sites in Yolo County: West Sacramento Senior Center, Knights Landing Community Center, Davis Senior Center, Winters Community Center, and the Woodland Senior Center. This program also offers home-delivery service for homebound seniors who are unable to come to the nutrition sites. Areas served through the home-delivery service include: Davis, Esparto, Knights Landing, West Sacramento, Winters, and Woodland.

Yolo Adult Day Health Center (YADHC), located at 20 North Cottonwood Street, Woodland, provides an affordable daytime program of health, rehabilitation and social services that assists adults to remain living at home with as much independence as possible. Participants attend the center one to five days per week and receive nursing care, personal care/grooming, social work services, physical therapy, and recreational and social activities. Lunch is served with specialized diets available. Participants must be 18 years or older, a Yolo County resident, and have health problems that interfere with independent living.

Davis Community Meals/Emergency and Transitional Housing, located at 1111 H Street, Davis, offers year round emergency shelter and transitional housing programs to all Yolo County residents from 6 p.m. to 8 a.m. daily. A day shelter/family resource center is also open on-site Monday through Friday from 8 a.m. to 2 p.m. The emergency shelter program houses single adult men and women for up to seven days, three times per year. The transitional housing for adult men and women provides long-term housing and supportive services through case management focusing on substance abuse, mental health, employment, and permanent housing assistance. The day shelter provides drop-in shelter and services including: laundry facilities, shower, counseling, bus passes, phone access, employment assistance, and food stamps. Referrals are available for housing, rental and utility assistance, food, clothing, and medical services. The family resource center provides services to families with children ages zero to five. The services include parenting classes, child development services, housing assistance, and life skills classes. Referrals are available for food, clothing, rental and utility assistance, medical and dental care, and mental health services.

HOUSING CHARACTERISTICS

Housing Composition

Tables 18 and 19 show annual changes in the housing stock for the City of Winters and Yolo County between January 1990 and January 2000 and January 2004, as determined by the California Department of Finance. Table 18 shows that in 2004 the substantial majority of dwelling units in Winters (80 percent) were single-family detached homes. Eight percent were multi-family dwellings in structures of five or more units, 3 percent were multi-family units in structures of two to four units, 3.6 percent were mobile homes, and 4.8 percent were single-family attached housing. By comparison, in 2004 about 56 percent of the housing stock in Yolo County were single-family detached homes, as shown in Table 19. As an additional comparison, in the year 2004 the adjacent community of Woodland had 57 percent of its housing stock in single-family detached homes. For Woodland, 20.5 percent were multi-family dwellings in structures of five or more units, 6.3 percent were multi-family units in structures of two to four units, 3.8 percent were mobile homes, and 7.2 percent were single-family attached housing.

Table 18

Housing Estimates for the City of Winters (1990 - 2000 and 2004)

Year	Housing Units							Persons Per Household
	Total	Single		Multiple		Mobile Homes	Occupied	
		Detached	Attached	2 to 4	5 Plus			
1990	1,564	1,155	73	89	152	95	1,506	3.08
1991	1,608	1,197	73	91	152	95	1,548	3.03
1992	1,617	1,197	81	91	152	96	1,557	3.09
1993	1,618	1,198	81	91	152	96	1,558	3.08
1994	1,671	1,213	81	91	190	96	1,609	3.03
1995	1,729	1,267	81	95	190	96	1,665	2.99
1996	1,781	1,303	81	99	202	96	1,715	3.00
1997	1,802	1,324	81	99	202	96	1,735	3.01
1998	1,806	1,328	81	99	202	96	1,735	3.01
1999	1,833	1,355	81	99	202	96	1,765	3.00
2000	1,891	1,413	81	91	99	202	1,821	3.03
2004	2,189	1,757	105	67	182	78	2,136	3.213

Source: California Department of Finance, 1990-2000 and
2004 City/County Population and Housing Estimates.

Note: Estimates from the California Department of Finance are calculated with an independent methodology and are different than what the U.S. Census reports.

Table 19

Housing Estimates for Yolo County (1990 - 2000 and 2004)

Year	Housing Units							Persons Per Household
	Total	Single		Multiple		Mobile Homes	Occupied	
		Detached	Attached	2 to 4	5 Plus			
1990	53,028	28,415	4,016	3,703	13,367	3,527	50,999	2.64
1991	58,819	28,981	4,037	3,772	13,471	3,558	51,760	2.63
1992	54,730	29,395	4,133	3,797	13,811	3,594	52,644	2.65
1993	55,625	29,773	4,182	3,976	14,079	3,615	53,511	2.63
1994	56,290	30,249	4,257	3,992	14,161	3,631	54,159	2.62
1995	50,169	26,175	4,097	3,797	13,471	2,629	48,421	2.59
1996	57,700	31,332	4,272	4,086	14,365	3,645	55,523	2.63
1997	58,379	31,947	4,278	4,149	14,359	3,646	56,180	2.63
1998	59,195	32,631	4,278	4,168	14,462	3,656	56,974	2.63
1999	59,911	33,357	4,290	4,162	14,446	3,656	57,670	2.63
2000	61,550	34,226	4,294	4,298	15,062	3,670	59,262	2.65
2004	67,027	38,197	4,958	4,598	15,622	2,652	64,751	2.718

Source: California Department of Finance, 1990-2000 and
2004 City/County Population and Housing Estimates.

Note: Estimates from the California Department of Finance are calculated with an independent methodology and are different than what the U.S. Census reports.

Housing Occupancy

Vacancy

Of the 1,954 year-round dwelling units in Winters reported by the Census Bureau in 2000, 1,907 units (98 percent) were occupied and 47 units (2 percent) were vacant (Table 20). By comparison, 96 percent of the dwelling units in Yolo County were occupied and 4 percent were vacant. Table 20 also shows that Winters' homeowner and rental vacancy rates were slightly higher than the rates for Yolo County.

Table 20

Housing Occupancy (2000)

	Winters	Yolo County	Winters Percent	Yolo County Percent
Occupied housing units	1,907	59,375	98%	96%
Vacant housing units	47	2,212	2%	4%
For seasonal, recreational, or occasional use	4	234	<1%	<1%
Total housing units	1,954	61,587	100%	100%
Homeowner vacancy rate			2%	<1%
Rental vacancy rate			4%	2%

Source: 2000 Census.

Homeownership

In 1990 and 2000, homeownership among Winters' households significantly exceeded that of households countywide. The homeownership rate in 1990 for the City was 68 percent, while countywide homeowners represented 52 percent of all households. This same relationship continued in 2000 when the Census reported the City's homeownership rate of 69 percent (1,314 homeowners), and the countywide rate of 53 percent (31,506 homeowners). By comparison, in 2000 homeowners in Woodland represented a little more than 58 percent of the households, while renters represented little less than 42 percent. Table 21 breaks down homeownership and rental rates among the different ethnic groups as identified by the 2000 Census.

Table 21

Homeownership Rates¹ (2000)

Race	Owners	Renters	Ownership Rate	Rental Rate
Non-Hispanic White	1,013	432	70.1%	29.9%
Black	--	--	--	--
Native American	--	--	--	--
Asian	--	--	--	--
Hispanic or Latino	465	224	67.5%	32.5%
Total	1,078	656	62.2%	37.8%

Source: 2000 Census.

¹ Data for Black, Native American, and Asian households is not available from Census 2000 as the result from each of the groups is below the minimum threshold of 100.

An analysis of homeownership rates by age in Winters reveals that persons age 45-54 years old have the highest ownership rates (Table 22). The majority of the age groups in Table 22 have homeownership rates equal to or above the ownership rate for Winters' population as a whole (68 percent), with both the very young (15-24) and those ages 25 to 44 years old as exceptions. Persons age 15-24 have a substantially higher (two-thirds) rental rate than ownership rate. This is to be expected as persons of this age are just becoming established and generally do not have the means necessary to purchase their own home. On the other end of the spectrum, persons over the age of 75 have homeownership rates well above Winters' overall population. Even though persons over the age of 75 are a small percentage of the population as a whole, this ownership rate is unusual, as persons of this age have frequently moved out of their homes and into a care facility.

Table 22**Homeownership Rates by Age (2000)**

Age	Owners	Renters	Ownership Rate	Rental Rate
15 to 24	25	49	34%	66%
25 to 34	186	140	57%	43%
35 to 44	385	169	69%	31%
45 to 54	312	101	76%	24%
55 to 64	169	60	75%	25%
65 to 74	114	47	71%	29%
75 and over	123	27	82%	18%
Total	1,314	593	69%	31%

Source: 2000 Census.

Tenure

Analysis of tenure by race and Hispanic or Latino origin for 2000 reveals that the majority of homeowners and renters in Winters are White; although, Hispanic or Latino homeowners made up 31.5 percent of owner occupied units and 34.1 percent of renter occupied units (Table 23). This disparity of White homeowners and renters is largely a function of population distribution; Whites comprise the largest percent of the population. Persons of Hispanic or Latino origin make up 44.4 percent of the Winters population. Home ownership and rental data for Black, Native American, Asian, and other races is not available from the 2000 Census as the ownership and rental status of each of these groups is below the minimum threshold of 100.

Table 23**Tenure by Race and Hispanic/Latino Origin¹ (2000)**

Race	Winters	Percent	Yolo County	Percent
Owner Occupied Units				
Non-Hispanic White	1,013	68.5%	25,792	78.1%
Black	--	--	333	1%
Native American	--	--	176	0.5%
Asian	--	--	1,661	5%
Hispanic or Latino	465	31.5%	5,033	15.3%
Total	1,478	100%	32,995	100%
Renter Occupied Units				
Non-Hispanic White	432	65.9%	18,230	62.6%
Black	--	--	821	2.8%
Native American	--	--	297	1%
Asian	--	--	3,454	11.9%
Hispanic or Latino	224	34.1%	6,341	21.8%
Total	656	100%	29,143	100%

Source: 2000 Census.

¹Persons of Hispanic Origin can be of any race. Data for Black, Native American, and Asian households is not available from Census 2000 as the result for each of these groups is below the minimum threshold of 100. The totals in the percentage columns will not total 100% because of rounding.

Age and Condition of Housing Stock

The age and condition of the housing stock provides additional measures of housing adequacy and availability in many communities. Although age does not always correlate with substandard housing conditions, neighborhoods with a preponderance of homes more than 40 years old are more likely than newer neighborhoods to have a concentration of housing in need of deferred maintenance, updating of utilities or interior amenities, rehabilitation, or replacement. Homes with deferred maintenance usually exhibit signs of aging, such as peeling or faded paint, cracked siding, or missing or broken shingles or shakes, that suggest a need for repair or replacement of those components in the near future. Homes in need of rehabilitation require immediate repair or replacement of components in disrepair to avoid health and safety problems. Homes in need of replacement require repair or replacement of so many components that it may be more cost effective to completely reconstruct the home or demolish and construct a new dwelling.

Table 24 shows that the highest percentage (38 percent) of housing units in the City were built between 1980 and March 1990. Between 1970 and 2001, 70 percent of the City's housing stock was built. This data reveals that homes in Winters are generally less than 30 years old—these newer dwellings are unlikely to need deferred maintenance, rehabilitation, or replacement. Based on age alone, it is estimated that less than 10 percent of the total housing stock is in need of housing rehabilitation and/or replacement. This estimate assumes that most homes 40 years old or more need

repairs and that some homes constructed during the 1970s may also be showing signs of deterioration.

In March 2002, the City Building Inspector and the Community Development Director conducted an informal housing conditions survey of the existing housing units in the City (single- and multi-family units). Based on the information collected through this survey, the City estimates that approximately 5 percent (90 units) of the City's total housing stock is in need of moderate rehabilitation and 1 percent (20 units) is in need of replacement. The City's 80-unit mobile home park was also evaluated in this survey, and although an exact number was not determined, the City estimates that a number of these units are in need of moderate to substantial rehabilitation.

Table 24

Age of Housing Units (2000)

	Number of Units	Percentage
1939 or earlier	136	6%
1940 to 1949	74	4%
1950 to 1959	194	10%
1960 to 1969	190	10%
1970 to 1979	234	12%
1980 to March 1990	762	38%
March 1990 to January 2000 ¹	349	18%
2001 ²	39	2%
Total	1,978	100%

Source: 2000 Census, California Department of Finance, 2001, and City of Winters, 2002.

¹Department of Finance Estimates.

²City building permits.

Housing Unit and Property Conditions

Other indicators of housing conditions are code enforcement activities. Table 25 provides information on the total number of housing-related code violations in the City of Winters from February 1997 to December 2001. Although the City's code violation records do not allow the City to directly estimate housing conditions, they do provide insight into the types of housing problems frequently encountered in Winters. The types of code violations reported were generally related to building without a permit, substandard housing conditions, or illegal second dwelling units.

Table 25

Housing Related Code Violations (2002)

Violation	Number
Substandard Building	10
Building Without Permits	43

Illegal Second Dwelling Unit	3
Illegal Wiring/Hazardous Conditions	2

Source: City of Winters, 2002.

Overcrowding

In general, overcrowding is a measure of the ability of existing housing to adequately accommodate residents. Too many individuals living in housing with inadequate space and number of rooms can result in deterioration of the quality of life within a community. The U.S. Census defines overcrowding as more than one person per room, excluding uninhabitable spaces such as hallways and bathrooms. Extreme overcrowding is often defined as more than 1.5 persons per room. Overcrowding results when either: 1) the costs of available housing with a sufficient number of bedrooms for larger families exceeds the family's ability to afford such housing, or 2) unrelated individuals (such as students or low-wage single adult workers) share dwelling units due to high housing costs. This can lead to overcrowded situations if the housing unit is not large enough to accommodate all of the people effectively.

Table 26 summarizes the overcrowding status in the City and County based on 2000 Census data. Approximately 7.3 percent of the City's occupied housing units were overcrowded, compared to 13 percent reported in the 1990 Census. Approximately 6.2 percent of the County's housing units were overcrowded in 2000, representing a reduction from the 10 percent reported by the 1990 Census.

Table 26

Persons Per Room in All Occupied Housing Units (2000)

Persons	City	Percent	County	Percent
1.00 or less	1,651	86%	52,543	89%
1.01 to 1.50	135	7%	3,176	5%
1.51 or more	140	7%	3,656	6%

Source: 2000 Census.

Table 27 shows that in 2000, 9.9 percent of renter-occupied units and 6 percent of owner-occupied units were defined as overcrowded in the City. In contrast, 9.6 percent renter-occupied and 3.1 percent owner-occupied units were overcrowded in the County. Comparably, there is a higher rate of overcrowding in the City of Winters than with the housing market countywide.

Table 27**Overcrowded Housing (2000)**

Number of Persons per Room	Rental Units	Percent of Total Occupied Rental Units	Owner Units	Percent of Total Occupied Owner Units
Winters				
1.01 to 1.50	56	8.9%	79	6.1%
1.51 or more	62	9.9%	78	6%
Total	118	18.8%	157	12.1%
Yolo County				
1.01 to 1.50	2,020	7.2%	1,156	3.7%
1.51 or more	2,688	9.6%	968	3.1%
Total	4,708	16.8%	2,124	6.8%

Source: 2000 Census.

Housing Costs***Rental Apartments***

Table 28 provides information on rental price ranges and median prices for apartment complexes in Winters and surrounding cities (January 2002). Searches for the City of Winters found rental apartments in the one-, two-, and three-bedroom categories. There were no studio apartments for rent found in Winters. The median rental price for a one-bedroom apartment was \$450 (this rental rate represents one affordable senior complex), while a two-bedroom was \$650 and a three-bedroom was \$900. By comparison, the surrounding cities of Woodland and Dixon had the most similar rents to Winters, while the cities of Davis and Vacaville had rents well above that of Winters and above fair market rents for existing housing in Yolo County.

Table 28

Rental Rates for Apartments in Winters and Surrounding Cities (January 2002)

City	Studio		1 Bedroom		2 Bedroom		3 Bedroom	
	Price Range	Median Price	Price Range	Median Price	Price Range	Median Price	Price Range	Median Price
Dixon	--	--	\$575- \$675	\$625	\$635- \$700	\$650	\$775- \$800	\$785
Winters	--	--	\$300- \$500 ¹	\$450 ¹	\$503- \$775	\$650	\$543- \$1,250	\$900
Woodland	\$300- \$650	\$405	\$355- \$695	\$480	\$425- \$895	\$575	\$585- \$800	\$675
Davis	\$430- \$700	\$575	\$485- \$1,130	\$640	\$560- \$1,305	\$855	\$620- 1,575	\$1,070
Vacaville	\$795- \$800	\$795	\$475- \$1,350	\$830	\$525- \$1,495	\$1,025	\$775- \$1,625	\$1,200

Source: apartments.com, sacbee.com, realtor.com, and homestore.com, January 2002.

¹Represents only one affordable senior apartment complex with government subsidies.

The 2002 fair market rents for the Yolo County area are provided in Table 29.

Table 29

Fair Market Rents for Existing Housing in Yolo County (2002)

Studio	1 Bedroom	2 Bedroom	3 Bedroom	4 Bedroom
\$504	\$575	\$712	\$986	\$1,165

Source: Federal Register, CA HUD, February 2002.

Winters Mobile Home Park is the only mobile home park within the City of Winters (Table 30). This park has 80 mobile home spaces and five recreational vehicle (RV) spaces. As of March 2002, all of the mobile home and RV spaces at Winters Mobile Home Park were occupied. According to contacts with Winters Mobile Home Park management, the park is primarily composed of families with children and some senior occupied units. Management has received several requests for occupation status and has had to turn away people wanting to either rent or purchase a mobile home. Opportunities exist to expand the park with two vacant adjoining lots.

Table 30

Winters Mobile Home Park

Name	Total Spaces	Monthly Rent
Mobile Home Spaces	80	\$290 - \$320
Recreational Vehicle Spaces	5	\$351.88 ¹

Source: Winters Mobile Home Park, January 2002.

¹Includes water, garbage, utilities, and hook up.

Home Prices

Table 31 lists prices of single-family resale homes that were sold in 2001. The highest percentage of homes sold in Winters in 2001 were three-bedroom homes (76 percent), followed by four-bedroom homes (13 percent).

Table 31

Resale Homes Sold in Winters (2001)

# of Bedrooms	Homes Sold in 2001	Median	Average	City Range	Percent of Total
1	-	--	--	--	--
2	3	\$174,500	\$174,500	\$160,995-\$191,902	8%
3	31	\$206,500	\$198,148	\$150,000-\$390,000	76%
4	5	\$224,900	\$216,480	\$175,600-\$244,900	13%
5	1	\$290,000	\$290,000	\$290,000	3%
Total	40	--	--	\$160,995-\$390,000	

Source: MetroList MLS, 2001.

Of new homes for sale in Winters in March 2002, the majority were priced in the mid- to high-\$200,000s range, although there were homes available in the low- to mid-\$300,000s range as well. Home sizes ranged from three-bedroom, two-bathroom homes of approximately 1,600 square feet to four-bedroom, three-bathroom homes of 2,300 square feet. Accounting for the range in home sizes, new home prices in Winters are below those in other parts of the region. New homes in Solano and Sacramento counties typically sell in the high-\$200,000 to low-\$400,000 range, although a few developments have homes in the low to mid-\$200,000 range (Table 32).

Table 32

New Home Sale Prices in Winters (March 2002)

Development	Price Range	Square Feet	Bedrooms/Bathrooms
Silver Ridge Schellinger Homes	Mid \$200,000s to Mid \$300,000s	1,700 – 2,300 497	3/2 – 4/3 1/1 granny flats-cottages available with some homes
Dry Creek Meadows DUC Housing Partners, Inc.	Low to Mid \$200,000s	1,600 – 2,300	3/2 – 4/3

Source: Schellinger Homes and DUC Housing Partners, Inc.,
March 2002.

Home Prices in Surrounding Areas

Table 33 is a list of median and average resale home prices throughout the City of Winters and the surrounding area for January 2002 (the data was not reported by size and number of bedrooms). The median home price in Winters was slightly higher than in the communities of Dixon and Woodland (approximately \$5,000 to \$40,000 greater). By comparison, Davis and Vacaville's median home prices were \$30,000 to \$240,000 higher than the City of Winters'.

Table 33

Median Home Prices for Winters and Surrounding Areas (January 2002)

Jurisdiction	Median Home Price	Average Home Price	Number of Units For Sale
Dixon	\$254,500	\$270,042	41
Winters	\$259,000	\$345,297	17
Woodland	\$219,500	\$254,984	73
Davis	\$499,700	\$525,316	49
Vacaville	\$289,900	\$301,052	120

Source: www.1.realtor.com and www.sacbee.com, January
2002.

Note: The median and average home prices are for resale homes only.

Lower Income Households Overpaying

A standard measure of housing affordability is that average housing expenses should not exceed 30 percent of a household's income. Those who pay 30 percent or more of their income on housing may have trouble affording other necessities; however, individual circumstances that can affect the ability to afford housing vary, such as other long-term debt payments, the number of household members, and other large ongoing expenses (such as medical bills). Since it is impossible to consider each household's individual circumstances, the 30 percent rule provides a general measure of housing affordability for the average household.

Based on the most recent 2000 Census data released, 355 (30 percent) homeowners in Winters pay 30 percent or more of their income on housing. Approximately 238 (38 percent) of all renters pay 30 percent or more of their income on housing.

Table 34

Housing Expenditures by Income Group (1999)

Income	<\$10,000	\$10,000- \$19,999	\$20,000- \$34,999	\$35,000- \$49,999	\$50,000+	Total Households ¹
Renters						
Under 30%	9	9	64	122	127	330
30-34%	17	--	26	16	--	59
35% +	43	69	67	--	--	179
Total Households	69	77	157	138	127	568
Owners						
Under 30%	--	38	82	67	648	835
30-34%	--	--	--	38	52	90
35% +	27	30	83	93	32	265
Total Households	27	68	165	198	732	1190

Source: 2000 Census.

¹ Vacant units are not included in total households.

Affordability Trends

Table 35 shows a percentage of affordable rental units at each income level in 2000. According to 2000 Census data, the median gross rent was \$692 in the City and \$687 in Yolo County. People with very low-incomes had few affordable housing options, as only 22 percent of apartment units in the City had rents below 30 percent of their income. People with low-incomes had more options than those with very low-incomes. Local rents were primarily within the affordability range of households in the upper end of the low-income range (65-80 percent of median income) and moderate-income households.

It is important to note that the percentage of apartments affordable within the low- and moderate-income groups is cumulative and include the percentage from the previous income group. Also, households of many income levels will compete for housing in the same price range, so the existence of lower-cost units does not mean that such units are actually available to lower-income households.

Table 35

Affordability of Rental Housing in Relation to Income (2000)

Income Group	Affordable Rent Limit	Percent of City Rentals	Total Rentals Available by Income Group	Percent of County Rentals	Total Rentals Available by Income Group
Very Low	\$509	22%	137	20%	5,370
Low	\$815	59%	371	60%	16,285
Moderate	\$1,223	84%	529	83%	22,568

Source: 2000 Census.

A household can typically qualify to purchase a home that is two and one-half to three times its annual income, depending on the down payment, the level of other long-term obligations (such as a car loan), and interest rates. In practice, the interaction of these factors allows some households to qualify for homes priced at more than three times their annual income, while other households may be limited to purchasing homes no more than two times their annual income. Table 36 shows that of the 43 homes sold in Winters in 2001, no homes were affordable to persons within the very low-income and low-income groups; however, just under half were affordable to persons within the moderate-income group. Homebuyer assistance programs that provide down payment assistance and/or below market-rate interest rates often allow homebuyers to qualify for houses that are up to four times their incomes. These assistance programs would be necessary for very-low and low-income household in Winters to be able to afford to purchase a new home in the community.

Table 36**Sold Units Affordable to Lower-Income Households (2001)¹**

Income Group	Affordability Level²	Homes For Sale in 2001³	Percent of All Homes For Sale
Very Low-Income	\$85,500	0	--
Low-Income	\$136,800	0	--
Moderate-Income	\$205,200	21	49%

Source: HUD 2001 Income Limits and MetroList MLS, 2002.

¹Units include single-family homes.²Affordability level based on the 2002 Yolo County median income (HUD 2002 Income Limits).³Homes sold were taken from a status list of all homes sold in Winters in 2001, MetroList MLS, Realty World Camelot Winters.

ASSISTED HOUSING PROJECTS

In 1989, the California Government Code was amended to include a requirement that localities identify and develop a program in their housing elements for the preservation of assisted, affordable multi-family units. Subsequent amendments have clarified the scope of the analysis to also include units developed pursuant to inclusionary housing and density bonus programs. In the preservation analysis, localities are required to provide an inventory of assisted, affordable units that are eligible to convert within ten years. As part of the analysis, an estimation of the cost of preserving versus replacing the units is to be included, as well as programs designed to preserve the affordable units.

Assisted Rental Housing Eligible for Conversion

Over the past several decades, hundreds of thousands of affordable rental housing units have been constructed in California with the assistance of federal, State, and local funding (loans or grants) that restricted rents and occupancy of units to low-income households for a specified period. Winters contains three such assisted rental housing developments. Once the period of rent/occupancy expires, a property owner may charge market rents. Low-income occupants are often displaced when rents rise to market levels. The housing element must identify any such publicly assisted rental units eligible for conversion, and include a program to address their preservation, if possible.

The inventory of assisted units includes a review of all multi-family rental units under federal, state and/or local programs, including HUD programs, State and local bond programs, redevelopment

programs, and local in-lieu fees (Inclusionary, density bonus, or direct assistance programs). The inventory also covers all units that are eligible for change to non-low-income housing units because of termination of subsidy contract, mortgage prepayment, or expiring use restrictions.

The owner of the Winters Apartments decided to opt out of his 44-unit apartment complex. The complex provides Rural Development Section 515 contracts to all 44 units. The Community Housing Opportunities Corporation purchased the housing complex, rehabilitated the units, and requested financial assistance from the City. The City provided a grant of \$250,000 from redevelopment housing set-aside funds and a loan/grant of \$185,000 through the use of Community Development Block Grant Program Income funds.

The cost of conserving the assisted units is estimated to be significantly less than that required to replace the units through new construction. Conservation of assisted units generally requires subsidizing the difference between market-rate and assisted rents. Since land prices and land availability are generally the limiting factors to development of affordable housing, it is estimated that subsidizing rents to preserve assisted housing is more feasible and economical than new construction.

The cost of acquiring apartment complexes on the market for use as assisted housing units could range from approximately \$60,000 per dwelling unit to over \$90,000 per dwelling unit, based on recent sales data of comparable rental housing (Table 38). The acquisition cost of multi-family units in the City, the replacement cost of a 44-unit complex would most likely exceed \$1 million.

Discussion with various developers who have constructed residential units within the past few years reveal that average construction costs vary depending on the location and type of unit. The cost of raw multi-family land is currently between \$20,000 and \$25,000 a unit. It is also estimated that multi-family construction costs (excluding land but including all soft costs, city fees, interest carry, and general administration) range from \$80 to \$95 per square foot. The cost of constructing 44 replacement units could range from \$60,000 to \$90,000 per dwelling unit, depending on the average size of the subsidized unit. If the payment of prevailing wages are required, the labor costs could increase by 30 to 40 percent.

Table 37 provides information on the three assisted rental units in the City of Winters: Almondwood Apartments, Winters Apartments, Winters Senior Apartments.

Table 37

Assisted Rental Units

Project Name	Address	Total Units	Total Assisted Units	Type	Expiration Date	Subsidy
Almondwood Apartments	801 Dutton Street	39	Yes	Family	2023	Rural Development Section 515
Winters Apartments	116 E. Baker Street #10	44	Yes	Family	2058	Rural Development Section 515
Winters Senior Apartments	400 Morgan Street #19	38	Yes	Senior	2043	Rural Development Section 515

With regard to Section 8 projects, the property owner can opt to terminate the Section 8 contract (opt-out), or renew the contract for another five years. The primary incentive for Section 8 property owners to opt-out is the higher rent that would be paid for these units at market value.

For the property owner to successfully opt-out of the Section 8 contract, the owner must satisfy certain procedural requirements. A Notice of Intent (NOI) must be filed with HUD one year before the termination date that indicates the owner's intent to convert the units to market rate. Failure to file an NOI within the specified timeframe, or follow the other procedures to opt-out of the Section 8 contract, results in an automatic contract rollover for five years.

Upon filing of an NOI, HUD may offer several incentives to property owners to remain in their contracts including re-financing the property mortgage, and establishing higher rents charged for the projects.

Pursuant to Section 65863.10 of the Government Code, the property owner of a Section 8 contract must also provide six months advanced notification to each tenant household if the property owner intends to terminate the Section 8 contract. The notice must indicate the anticipated date of conversion and the anticipated rent increase, the possibility of remaining subsidized, the owner's intentions, and the appropriate contacts for additional information. The property owner must also send a copy of the statement to the City or County where the property is located, to the appropriate local housing authority and to the Department of Housing and Community Development. The statement must indicate the number, age, and income of affected tenants, the type of assistance, and the owner's plans for the project.

There are several non-profit organizations active in the region that have the managerial capacity to own and manage, and have expressed an interest in being notified of the availability of assisted rental housing. Table 38 lists these organizations.

Table 38**Non-Profit Housing Organizations Interested in Acquiring At-Risk Rental Housing**

Organization	Address	City/County
ACLC Inc.	42 N. Sutter St., Suite 206	Stockton
Affordable Housing Associates	1250 Adison St., Suite G	Berkeley
Bridge Housing Corporation	One Hawthorne, Suite 400	San Francisco
C. Sandidge and Associates	143 Scotts Valley	Hercules
Christian Church Homes of Northern CA, Inc.	303 Hegenberger Road, Suite 201	Oakland
Community Housing Developer, Inc.	255 N. Market Street, Suite 290	San Jose
Community Housing Development Corp.	1452 Filbert Street, P.O. Box 1625	Richmond
Community Housing Opportunities Corp.	1490 Drew Ave.	Davis
East Bay Asian Local Development Corp.	310 Eighth Street, Suite 200	Oakland
Eden Housing, Inc.	409 Jackson Street	Hayward
Eskaton Properties, Inc.	5105 Manzanita Ave.	Carmichael
Foundation for Affordable Housing, Inc.	2847 Story Rd.	San Jose
O.P.E.N. Inc.	P.O. Box 43034	Oakland
Oakland Community Housing, Inc.	405 14 th Street, Suite 40	Oakland
Pacific Community Services, Inc.	329 Railroad Ave., P.O. Box 1397	Pittsburgh
Phoenix Programs, Inc.	1875 Willows Pass Road, Suite 300	Concord
Resources for Community Development	2131 University Ave., Suite 224	Berkeley
Richmond Neighborhood Housing Service, Inc.	500 South 15 th Street	Richmond
Rubicon Programs, Inc.	2500 Bissell Ave.	Richmond
Rural CA Housing Corp.	2125 19 th Street, Suite 101	Sacramento
Satellite Senior Homes	2526 Martin Luther King Jr. Way	Berkeley
Senior Housing Foundation	1788 Indian Wells Way	Clayton
Vallejo Neighborhood Housing Services, Inc.	610 Lemon Street	Vallejo

Source: CA Housing and Community Development
Department, September 2001.**AFFORDABLE HOUSING DEVELOPMENT**

Winters' General Plan contains goals, policies, and implementation programs designed to ensure that affordable housing is constructed and maintained within the City. The current 1994 Housing Element contains a policy that requires at least 15 percent of all new housing units be affordable to persons of very low-, low-, or moderate-income households, with 6 percent of new housing being affordable to very low-income households and 9 percent being affordable to low- or moderate-

income households. These percentages are in proportion to the unmet needs identified in the Housing Element General Plan Background Report (1992).

The affordable housing policy is community-wide. Every project/subdivision of five lots or more is required to meet the 15 percent affordable housing provision; however, every project's affordable housing program is individualized to the specific development. Whatever the developer/builder and City jointly decide is the affordable housing program; it needs to be identified prior to the approval of the Final Map for the subdivision.

While the City's goal is to see that all required affordable housing units are ultimately constructed at location(s) within the City, the approved affordable housing program for each development may include, but is not limited to a combination of the following elements:

- construction of dwelling units (single-family or multi-family) for sale or rental (on the project site or at another location in the City);
- an irrevocable offer of dedication of land;
- payment of an in-lieu fee instead of constructing units or dedicating land; and
- density bonuses for very low- and low-income units pursuant to the State statute.

The City requires, through a condition of project approval and inclusion in the subdivision improvement and maintenance agreement, language that acknowledges the subdivider is aware of the General Plan requirements to disperse affordable housing throughout the community. Concentration or isolation of affordable housing is to be avoided. Affordable housing that is developed because of the City's policy is required to be affordable to very low- and low-income households for a period of not less than 55 years.

FUTURE HOUSING NEEDS

State law (California Government Code Section 65584) requires that each city and county plan to accommodate a fair share of the region's housing construction needs. In urban areas, State law provides for councils of governments to prepare regional housing allocation plans that assign a share of a region's housing construction need to each city and county. In the six-county greater Sacramento region (comprising the counties of Sacramento, Placer, El Dorado, Yolo, Sutter, and Yuba), the Sacramento Area Council of Governments is the entity authorized under state law to determine the future housing needs for the region. SACOG adopted a regional housing allocation plan in September 2001, called the "Regional Housing Needs Plan" (RHNP). This plan covers a seven and one-half period from January 1, 2000 through June 30, 2007.

Existing need is evaluated based on overpayment (30 percent or more of income) and overcrowding by lower-income households. The housing allocation also includes an "avoidance of impaction" adjustment to reduce the further concentration of low-income households in jurisdictions that have more than the regional average. The RHNP also establishes each city's and county's existing unmet need based on overpayment and overcrowding.

SACOG's methodology is based on regional population and housing forecasts developed for its transportation model. The numbers of housing units assigned in the plan to each jurisdiction are goals that are intended to address the minimum new housing construction need from anticipated population growth in the region.

The housing units allocated in the plan to each city and county are considered minimum needs. Most, if not all, jurisdictions have existing unmet housing needs (such as from overcrowding and overpayment) that should be considered during the preparation of a housing element and which may result in housing construction objectives that exceed the regional allocation. The City must however use the numbers allocated under the RHNP to identify measures (policies and ordinances) that are consistent with these new construction goals. While the City must also show how it will provide adequate sites for construction of the required units, it is not obligated to build any of the units itself or finance their construction. According to the RHNP, the City of Winters has a total housing construction need of 772 units, which equates to an annual need of roughly 103 units. Table 39 shows the Winters 2000-2007 planning period allocation.

Table 39**Regional Housing Needs Allocation (2000 – 2007)**

Dwelling Units	Percent of Total	Income Level
188	25%	Very Low-Income
125	16%	Low-Income
118	15%	Moderate-Income
341	44%	Above Moderate-Income
772	100%	Total

Sources: SACOG 2000-2007 Regional Housing Needs Plan,
Parsons 2002.

FUTURE DEVELOPMENT POTENTIAL

The City of Winters has identified 31 parcels with the potential for future residential development. A breakdown of these parcels is contained in Table 42. Of the parcels identified in Table 42, 29 of them are at least one-acre in size. A total of 15 parcels are at least five acres or larger.

Areas with Potential for Residential Development

The City of Winters estimates that there are approximately 480.09 acres of undeveloped or underdeveloped land available within the City's borders that have the potential to accommodate residential units. This land has the potential to accommodate 1937 new units in various residential and mixed-use zones; this information is summarized in Table 41. The potential for residential development for each specific site is described in detail below. All areas have established Single Family, 7,000 Square Foot Average Minimum; Single Family 6,000 Square Foot Average Minimum; Multi-Family Residential; and High Density Multi-Family Residential land uses, or commercial mixed-use designations.

1. Cottages at Carter Ranch

Sacramento Pacific Development is nearing completion for the construction of 30 detached single-family units on a portion of a 3.3-acre site located south of Anderson Avenue and north of the Carter Ranch project. This project was constructed to address the affordable housing requirement for the Carter Ranch project. Cottages includes 15 units reserved for low-income households, 11 reserved

for moderate-income households, and 5 units reserved for very low-income households. The project received a bonus density and planned development (PD) overlay. The PD allowed reduced standards for low sizes, setbacks, parking, and other development standards. The City Council also deferred impact fees for 22 of the 30 units until the close of escrow. The buyers for many of the very low- and low-income homes are expected to receive first time homebuyer loans through the City.

2. *Winters Townhomes and Apartments*

All entitlements for this 15-unit multi-family rental project have been approved. The project consists of two parcels (totaling 1.16 acres) located at the intersection of East Main and East Baker Streets. A density bonus of 25-percent and a Planned Development overlay to provide flexible yard setbacks were incorporated into the project. Three units will be restricted to low-income households through an affordable housing agreement. Public infrastructure is largely complete as a result of the construction of infrastructure needed for adjacent residential development. Construction of the residential units will likely begin next year. While sites less than two acres are often economically infeasible for multi-family project developers, the combination of a density bonus, planned development overlay, and limited infrastructure expenses have made this project economically feasible.

3. *Callahan Estates*

The City is processing an application – including Tentative Subdivision Map and Development Agreement – for this 26.436-acre project proposed by the Hofmann Land Development Company. Zoning for the project site is Single Family, 7,000 Square Foot Average Minimum (R-1); the project is proposed for 120 single-family dwelling units. The City's fifteen-percent affordable housing requirement is expected to be achieved through duplexes. The site is within walking distance from intermediate and middle schools as well as a school district agricultural facility. The Planning Commission on January 12, 2005 is expected to hold its final meeting on the project. Winters Highlands will benefit from development of the Callahan site as portions of the Highlands infrastructure must cross the Callahan property.

4. *Creekside Estates*

The City is processing an application – including Tentative Subdivision Map, General Plan Amendment, Re-Zone, and Development Agreement – for this 13.75-acre project proposed by Don Miller of Davis. Zoning for the project site is Single Family, 6,000 Square Foot Average Minimum (R-2); the project is proposed for up to 41 single-family dwelling units. The southerly boundary of Creekside Estate is Dry Creek. As a result, a 50-foot building setback measure from top of the high bank (of Dry Creek) is required for all of the proposed lots that border Dry Creek in order to ensure creek bank stabilization. The City's fifteen-percent affordable housing requirement is expected to be achieved through either a cash contribution to the CHOC project, construction of 6 duplexes on the project site, or a combination of the first two. The site is within walking distance from an elementary school and near public transportation. The site has frontage on Grant Avenue and Main Street, and development of the project may benefit from the public infrastructure located in Grant and Main.

5. *CHOC*

The Winters Community Development Agency (redevelopment agency and known as the CDA) purchased the 1.71-acre parcel on East Baker Street in November. The site is zoned High Density

Multi-Family Residential (R-4 Zone) and the CDA anticipates partnering with the Community Housing Opportunities Corporation (CHOC), a non-profit housing developer, in Davis to develop a 34-unit apartment complex for very low- and low-income households. Development of this infill site will benefit from adjacent public infrastructure. The north side of the property, which is the only side with access to a street, has direct access to an improved street – including future connections to water, sewer, storm drain, etc. The site is within walking distance to public transportation and shopping.

The CHOC site is directly west of the Winters Apartments facility and development of the project could be linked with the existing Winters Apartments facility. The apartment complex which serves very low- and low-income households was constructed in the early 1980s with funding assistance from the U.S. Department of Agriculture (Section 515) and was at risk of being converted to market rate housing. In 2003, CHOC partnered with the City to purchase and rehabilitate the 44-unit Winters Apartments facility. The City and CDA provided \$435,000 in grants and loans.

While sites less than two acres in size are often economically unfeasible for multi-family project developers, CHOC has been able to accommodate 34 residential units, a community room, and a small playground/green space/picnic area on the 1.71-acre East Baker Street site. The community room and playground/green space/picnic area will be shared with the Winters Apartments Complex. Furthermore, the more extensive playground/open space areas of the Winters Apartments could be share with the CHOC project.

6. *Winters Highlands*

The City is processing an application – including Tentative Subdivision Map, General Plan Amendments, Re-Zonings, and Development Agreement – for this 101.543-acre project proposed by Granite Bay Holdings, LLC. Zoning for the project site is Single Family, 7,000 Square Foot Average Minimum (R-1); Single Family 6,000 Square Foot Average Minimum (R-2); High Density Multi-Family Residential (R-4); Parks and Recreation (P-R); and Open Space (O-S). The project is proposed for 442 dwelling units: 378 single-family homes and 64 multi-family units. The project also includes a 10-acre park/open space (wetland) are. The City's fifteen-percent affordable housing requirement is expected to be achieved through the multi-family units, duplexes, and possible some of the small single-family lots. The project will need to pre-pay a portion or all of its wastewater impact fees to help facilitate the Wastewater Treatment Facility Phase II Expansion; not all of the project's units could be accommodated under the existing capacity of the wastewater treatment facility. Other infrastructure issues included the need to construct a wastewater pump station to handle wastewater flows from the project, changes to the Rancho Arroyo Drainage Basin to address the portion of the project located in the General Plan Flood Overlay Area, and the construction of a water well within the project site. The project is the subject is a focused EIR (environmental impact report) on biological issues and is not expected to return to the Planning Commission for consideration until late Spring or Summer 2005.

7. *Hudson-Ogando*

The City is processing an application – including Tentative Subdivision Map, General Plan Amendment, Re-Zone, and Development Agreement – for this 15.968-acre project proposed by the Hofmann Land Development Company. Zoning for the project is Multi-Family Residential (R-3) and Single Family, 7,000 Square Foot Average Minimum (R-1); the project is proposed for 65 single-family units; and a 2.149-acre portion of the project site is proposed for a future police/fire/public works corporation yard facility. The City's fifteen percent affordable housing requirement is expected to be achieved through small lot, single-family units. The site is within

walking distance of the middle and intermediate schools. A portion of the site will benefit from the infrastructure constructed on Main Street north of Grant Avenue for the completed Carter Ranch project.

8. Carter Property

The infrastructure of the Carter Ranch Phase I and II Subdivisions – particularly the street, water, and sewer facilities – has been designed to incorporate a parcel bordering both subdivisions for future residential development. This parcel is 5.69 acres in size, zoned Single Family, 7,000 Square Foot Average Minimum, and could accommodate 29 residential units based on 5.11 units/acre.

9. Cordes

This site consists of three parcels totaling 4.522 acres under one ownership. The properties are zoned Central Business District (C-2). Multi-family housing is a conditional use in a C-2 zone. Simpson Housing Solutions filed a conditional use permit application for this site in 2001 in order to construct an 81-unit (rental) affordable housing project (non-mixed use). Simpson withdrew its application in 2002. Three sides of the project have street frontages while the fourth side is a commercial strip mall. The properties are within walking distance to public transportation and shopping. It is estimated that a mixed-use project at this site could yield at least 20 dwelling units.

10. LDS

The LDS Church owns this 3.29-acre parcel, which is zoned Single Family, 7,000 Square Foot Average Minimum (R-1). The property borders the local LDS Stake at the far west end of Anderson Avenue. Development of the property would benefit from the public infrastructure constructed for either Winters Highlands or Callahan Estates or both projects. The site is within walking distance from middle, elementary, and high schools. The property could accommodate 17 dwelling units based on based on 5.11 units/acre.

11. Valadez

The 2.792-acre parcel is zoned Single Family, 7,000 Square Foot Average Minimum (R-1). Development of this infill site will benefit from adjacent public infrastructure. The east side of the property has direct access to an improved street – including future connections to water, sewer, storm drain, etc. The site is within walking distance to middle, elementary, and high schools. Development of this parcel would generate 14 dwelling units based on 5.11 units/acre.

12. Church Property

The 5.56-acre parcel is zoned Single Family 6,000 Square Foot Average Minimum (R-2). A portion of the property contains a church facility while the remainder, approximately three acres, is undeveloped. The parcel could be subdivided to allow for residential construction on the undeveloped acreage. Development of the project would benefit from the existing infrastructure on Main Street. All project access would be through Main Street. The property could accommodate 18 dwelling units based on 6.16 units/acre.

13. East Main Street PC

This 4.38-acre parcel has a General Plan land use designation of Planned Commercial. Property with this land use designation can be zoned as either Neighborhood Commercial (C-1), Office (O-F), Parks and Recreation (P-R), Open Space (O-S), or Public/Quasi-Public (PQP). Multi-family

housing is a conditional use in C-1 and O-F zones. Infrastructure (water, sewer, streets, etc.) is adjacent to the site as existing streets border three sides of the property and the site has convenient access to the State Highway 128/Interstate 505 interchange. A portion of the site is located within a 100-year flood zone. As a result, an on-site flood control facility may be necessary for development of the site. It is estimated that a mixed-use project on this parcel could yield at least 20 dwelling units, but the yield could be reduced if an on-site flood control facility is required.

14. Grant Avenue PC

The 6.01-acre parcel has a General Plan land use designation of Planned Commercial. Property with this land use designation can be zoned as either Neighborhood Commercial (C-1), Office (O-F), Parks and Recreation (P-R), Open Space (O-S), or Public/Quasi-Public (PQP). Multi-family housing is a conditional use in C-1 and O-F zones. Infrastructure (water, sewer, streets, etc.) is adjacent to the site as existing streets border all sides (four) of the property, and the site is within walking distance to public transportation and shopping. A portion of the site is located within a 100-year flood zone. As a result, an on-site flood control facility may be necessary for development of the site. The parcel has convenient access to the State Highway 128/Interstate 505 interchange. A mixed-use project on this site could yield at least 25 dwelling units, but the yield could be reduced if an on-site flood control facility is required.

15. Niemann Street

This ten-acre parcel is zoned Single Family, 7,000 Square Foot Average Minimum (R-1, approximately seven acres) and Multi-Family Residential (R-3, approximately three acres). The property has frontage on an existing street, Niemann Street, and is within walking distance to the middle, intermediate, and high schools as well as the school district agricultural facility. The site is located in the General Plan Flood Overlay Area, but only a small portion of the property is located in a 100-year flood zone. It is uncertain whether the development of the site will require the construction of on-site flood control facilities, but development of the site will require the payment of fees to finance a future flood control project in the north area of the City's General Plan Area. The property could accommodate 66 dwelling units based on 5.11 units/acre for R-1 and 10 units/acre for R-3, but this number would likely be reduced if an on-site flood control facility is required.

16. Railroad Avenue and Walnut Lane

The ten-acre property is located between Grant Avenue and Walnut Lane and is zoned High Density Multi-Family Residential (R-4, approximately five acres) and Parks and Recreation (P-R, approximately five acres). The R-4 portion of the property has frontage on an existing street, Railroad, and the P-R portion of the property has frontage on an existing street, Walnut. The site is located in the General Plan Flood Overlay Area. As a result, development of the property would likely require the construction of on-site interim flood control facilities and the payment of fees to finance a future flood control project in the north area of the City's General Plan Area. However, development of the R-4 portion of the property may not require the construction of an on-site interim flood control facility since the R-4 portion is not located in a 100-year flood zone. Development of the R-4 portion of the site could yield 88 dwelling units based on 17.5 units/acre. American Communities, a developer of multi-family projects, has expressed an interest in constructing a project on the R-4 portion of the property. American Communities has not filed an application at this time.

17. Corbett Property

This ten-acre parcel is zoned Single Family, 7,000 Square Foot Average Minimum (R-1) and is located at the north end of Walnut Lane. The site is located in the General Plan Flood Overlay Area. As a result, development of the property would likely require the construction of an on-site interim flood control facility and the payment of fees to finance a future flood control project in the north area of the City's General Plan Area. The property could accommodate 51 dwelling units based on 5.11 units/acre, but this number would likely be reduced if an on-site interim flood control facility is required.

18. Railroad Avenue

This site of 6.979 acres consists of four separate parcels under multiple ownerships and zoned High Density Multi-Family Residential (R-4). Most of the area has frontage on Railroad Avenue. These properties are located in the General Plan Flood Overlay Area. As a result, development of the property would likely require the construction of on-site interim flood control facilities and the payment of fees to finance a future flood control project in the north area of the City's General Plan Area. Development of these parcels as a single project could accommodate 122 dwelling units based on 20 units/acre, but this number would likely be reduced if on-site interim flood control facilities are required.

19. Grant Avenue North

The 61.65-acre property is zoned Single Family, 7,000 Square Foot Average Minimum (R-1, approximately 33.91 acres); Open Space (O-S, approximately 12.74 acres); and the unzoned portion, approximately 15 acres, has a General Plan land use designation of Planned Commercial. Property designated Planned Commercial can be zoned as either Neighborhood Commercial (C-1), Office (O-F), Parks and Recreation (P-R), Open Space (O-S), or Public/Quasi-Public (PQP). Multi-family housing is a conditional use in C-1 and O-F zones. The south side of the site has frontage on an existing street, Grant Avenue, while the site has convenient access to the State Highway 128/Interstate 505 interchange. The parcel is located in the General Plan Flood Overlay Area. As a result, development of the property would likely require the construction of on-site interim flood control facilities and the payment of fees to finance a future flood control project in the north area of the City's General Plan Area. Development of the R-1 portion of the parcel could accommodate 173 dwelling units based on 5.11 units/acre for R-1. The open space portion of the property may be able to accommodate interim flood control facilities that could benefit the adjacent residential development.

20. North Winters, West

This 160-acre parcel is located north of Niemann Street and directly west of Railroad Avenue. Residential zoning consists of Single Family, 7,000 Square Foot Average Minimum (R-1, approximately 21.3 acres), Single Family 6,000 Square Foot Average Minimum (R-2, approximately 47.9 acres), and High Density Multi-Family Residential (R-4, approximately 3.6 acres). The parcel is located in the General Plan Flood Overlay Area. Construction of a significant flood control project with on- and off-site facilities would be required before this area could develop. This property could accommodate 467 dwelling units based on 5.11 units/acre for R-1, 6.16 units/acre for R-2, and 17.5 units/acre for R-4.

21. *North Winters, East*

The 25.35-acre property is zoned Multi-Family Residential (R-3, approximately eight acres) and Open Space (O-S, 17.35 acres approximately). The site is directly east of Railroad Avenue and adjacent to the *North Winters, West* area. The parcel is located in the General Plan Flood Overlay Area. Construction of a significant flood control project with on- and off-site facilities would be required before this area and the *North Winters, East* area could develop. This property could accommodate 80 dwelling units based on 10 units/acre for R-3.

There are no significant environmental or infrastructure constraints for the first 12 areas described above and summarized in Table 40 that would prevent these sites from being developed for residential use within the next five years or less. Water, sewer, and other necessary public facilities and services are either available, or can be readily expanded, to serve these undeveloped or under-developed sites. The City charges appropriate development impact fees to ensure that water lines, sewer lines, roads and other necessary infrastructure to serve new residential development can be extended in a timely manner. Environmental concerns, such as endangered species or wetlands, do not significantly affect undeveloped and under-developed lands within the City's boundaries and would not be a constraint to new development.

Historically, developers in Winters have built at densities below what the City's Zoning Ordinance allows. Past construction at less-than-maximum permitted densities was not due to environmental or other constraints that precluded achievement of maximum densities, but due to market factors and builder preferences.

Calculation of the potential number of new dwelling units within each residential zoning district was based on 70-percent of the maximum zoning densities for the R-1 and R-2 Zones and maximum zoning densities for the R-3 and R-4 Zones (10 dwelling units/acre for R-3 and 20 dwelling units/acre for R-4).

The City has been able to accommodate housing affordable to low- and very low-income households at presently zoned densities in the Multi-family Residential (R-3) and High Density Multi-family Residential (R-4) districts, even at the average densities at which housing has previously been constructed (7 to 15 units per acre). Affordable housing projects, as noted below, have been constructed at higher than average densities since the 1990s.

The City of Winters' R-3 district has a total of 14.83 acres of vacant land that could potentially accommodate 148 new dwelling units, while the R-4 district has a total of 22.79 acres of vacant land with the development potential of 456 new residential units. Combined these two districts, at maximum zoning densities (of 10 units/acre for R-3 and 20 units/acre for R-4) could potentially accommodate up to 604 new dwelling units affordable to low- or very low-income households. The City's regional allocation for very low- and low-income households is 313 dwelling units. With the City's existing vacant land zoned R-3 and R-4, Winters will be able to accommodate its regional allocation share for low- and very low-income households.

The following are three examples of densities for affordable multi-family projects constructed in Winters. The densities of these projects ranged from approximately 11 to 18 units per acre. The trend since the early 1980s has been for affordable housing projects to develop at higher densities. The past project densities for affordable multi-family projects have ranged from 10.97 to 17.76 dwelling units per acre for the High Density Multi-Family Residential (R-4) zone. The maximum density for R-4 is 20 units/acre. Past densities for affordable multi-family projects will likely not be adequate to facilitate sufficient production of affordable housing. Future affordable multi-family

projects will need to be constructed at the upper one-quarter of the R-4 density range and may require density bonuses in some instances.

<u>Project Name</u>	<u>Constructed</u>	<u>Units</u>	<u>Acreage</u>	<u>Density/Acre</u>
1. Senior Apartments	<u>1994</u>	<u>39</u>	<u>2.196</u>	<u>17.76</u>
2. Almondwood Apartments	<u>1983</u>	<u>39</u>	<u>3.555</u>	<u>10.97</u>
3. Winters Apartments	<u>1982</u>	<u>44</u>	<u>3.4041</u>	<u>12.93</u>

Areas with Redevelopment and/or Re-Use Potential

Areas with the greatest redevelopment potential within Winters are located in the City's Redevelopment District. The Redevelopment District is approximately 669 acres and consists of one complete part, with one exception area.

The City has identified two properties within the Winters Redevelopment Area as having residential redevelopment potential. These two properties are zoned residential; one has a non-residential primary use while the other is undeveloped. The first parcel is a 3.28 acre site zoned R-1 (Single Family, 7,000 Square Foot Average Minimum) that houses a truck yard, while the second parcel is a 1.71 acre site zoned R-4 (high density multi-family residential). The second property is also detailed under the Areas with Potential for Residential Development section of the Housing Needs Assessment. The City estimates that these two properties could be redeveloped to accommodate up to 16 single-family dwelling units in the R-1 District (at a construction density of 5.11 units/acre) and 26 multi-family dwelling units in the R-4 District (at an average construction density of 15.4 units/acre). The likelihood of either property being redeveloped depends on the value of these properties in their current uses versus potential residential uses. The first property is located in the General Plan Flood Overlay Area. At the direction of the City Council, staff has been working with the City's storm drain consultant to develop a "generic" flood control project and financing plan that may allow some properties within the Flood Overlay Area to develop prior to the construction of a comprehensive flood control project. A draft of this plan was presented to the City Council at a workshop held in October.

Table 40

Winters Vacant Land Inventory

	Name	Applicant	Street Name/APN	Acres	Zoning	Zoning Code Density (units/acre)	Under Construction	Actual Or Potential Dwelling Units
1.	Cottages at Carter Ranch	Sacramento Pacific Development	Anderson Avenue/ 030-220-37	3.3	R-2	8.8	Yes	30
2.	Winters Townhomes	B. Thomson & N. Whitman	E. Main St./038- 190-34, 038-205-08	1.16	O-F	10	No	15
3.	Callahan Estates	Hofmann Land Dev. Company	Anderson Avenue/ 030-220-22	26.436	R-1	7.3	No	120
4.	Creekside Estates	Don Miller	Grant Ave & Main St/003-430-12 & 003-430-04	13.75	R-2	8.8	No	41
5.	CHOC	--	East Baker Street/ 003-370-15	1.71	R-4	20	No	34
6.	Winters Highlands	Granite Bay Holdings	Moody Slough Rd./ 030-220-17, 19 & 33	101.543	R-1, R-2, R-4, P-R & O-S	7.3 (R-1), 8.8 (R-2) & 20 (R-4)	No	442
7.	Hudson- Ogando	Hofmann Land Dev. Company	Main St./003-430-13 & 003-430-05	15.968	R-1 & R-3	7.3 (R-1) & 10 (R-3)	No	65
8.	Carter Property	--	Grant Avenue/ 003-530-44	5.69	R-1	7.3	No	29
9.	Cordes	--	Grant Avenue/ 003-370-28-30	4.522	C-2	20	No	20
10.	LDS	--	Anderson Avenue/ 030-220-34	3.29	R-1	7.3	No	17
11.	Valadez	--	Hemenway Street/ 003-391-01	2.792	R-1	7.3	No	14
12.	Church Property	--	Main St./003-120-03	5.56	R-2	8.8	No	18
13.	East Main Street PC	--	East Main Street/ 038-070-35	4.38	Not zoned per General Plan	10 (C-1)	No	20

	Name	Applicant	Street Name/APN	Acres	Zoning	Zoning Code Density (units/acre)	Under Construction	Actual Or Potential Dwelling Units
14.	Grant Avenue PC	--	Grant Avenue/ 038-190-35	6.01	Not zoned per General Plan	10 (C-1)	No	25
15.	Niemann Street	--	Niemann Street/ 030-220-27	10	R-1 & R-3	7.3 (R-1) & 10 (R-3)	No	66
16.	RR Ave & Walnut Lane	--	Railroad Avenue/ 003-360-05	10	R-4 & P-R	20 (R-4)	No	88
17.	Corbett	--	Walnut Lane/ 038-050-19	10	R-1	7.3 (R-1)	No	51
18.	RR Avenue	--	Railroad Avenue/ 038-050-21 & 23, 003-360-10 & 14	6.979	R-4	20	No	122
19.	Grant Avenue North	--	Grant Avenue/ 038-050-18	61.65	R-1, O-S & PC (General Plan land use designation)	7.3 (R-1)	No	173
20.	North Winters, West	--	Railroad Avenue/ 030-210-04	160	R-1, R-2 & R-4	7.3 (R-1), 8.8 (R-2) & 20 (R-4)	No	467
21.	North Winters, East	--	Railroad Avenue/ 038-050-68	25.35	R-3 & O-S	10 (R-3)	No	80
Totals	--	--	--	480.09	--	--	--	1937

Source: City of Winters, November, 2004.

Notes: Based on information current as of November 30, 2004. As previously stated in Program II.5, manufactured homes on permanent foundations are allowed in the R-1, R-2, and R-3 zoning districts. Emergency Shelters are allowed with a conditional use permit in the R-3, R-4, and PQP zoning districts. The Zoning Ordinance will be amended to allow transitional housing and farmworker housing in the R-3 and R-4 zoning districts.

Table 41**Residential Projects Completed Since Start (January 1, 2000) Of Current Regional Housing Needs Plan Period**

	Name	Applicant	Street Name/APN	Acres	Zoning	Zoning Code Density (units/acre)	Under Construction	Actual Or Potential Dwelling Units
1.	Carter Ranch Phase II	Duc Housing Partners	Main Street (north)/Various	14.99	R-1 (R-2 when constructed)	7.3 (currently)	Completed in 2004	85
2.	Winters Village #2	Clyde Miles Construction	Niemann Street/Various	4.6	R-2	8.8	Completed in 2003	18
3.	Carter Ranch Phase I	Duc Housing Partners	Main Street (north)/Various	11	R-2	8.8	Completed in 2002	55
4.	Silver Ridge Estates	Schellinger Brothers	Kennedy Drive/Various	7.46	R-2	8.8	Completed in 2002	35 (includes 6 second dwelling units)
5.	Putah Creek Hamlet #2	Mercy Housing for low-income units	Red Bud Lane Creekside Drive, etc./Various	--	R-2 PD	8.8	Remaining completed in 2002	30 (estimate, most of the units were sweat equity low-income units)
6.	Infill	--	Various/Various	--	R-1, R-2	7.3 (R-1), 8.8 (R-2)	--	6 (estimate)
Totals	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	229

Source: City of Winters, November, 2004.

Table 42

Winters Summary Of Undeveloped And Under-Developed Land By Parcel Size

Zoning Designation	Parcel Size				Total Number of Parcels
	Less Than 1 Acre	1 – 3 Acres	3 – 5 Acres	Over 5 Acres	
R-1		1	2	5	8
R-2		1	1	1	3
R-4		5			5
C-1	2				2
C-2		3			3
PC ¹			1	1	2
R-1, R-2					
R-1, R-3				2	2
R-4, P-R				1	1
R-3, O-S				1	1
R-1, R-2, R-4				2	2
R-1, P-R, O-S				1	1
R-1, PC ² , O-S				1	1
TOTALS	2	10	4	15	31

Source: City of Winters, November, 2004.

¹ PC (Planned Commercial) is a General Plan land use designation. Property with this land use designation can be zoned as either Neighborhood Commercial (C-1), Office (O-F), Parks and Recreation (P-R), Open Space (O-S), or Public/Quasi-Public (PQP). Multi-family housing is a conditional use in C-1 and O-F zones.

² See the above footnote.

Existing Infrastructure

The City of Winters is in the process of upgrading its wastewater treatment facility to accommodate the City's regional housing allocation. The City has completed Phase 1a of the process, which was the expansion of the existing spray fields and an additional retaining pond and Phase 1b, which involved grading and irrigation improvements to the facility's original sprayfields. Both Phase 1a and 1b increased the capacity of the facility. The City's design engineer has completed preliminary engineering for the Phase 2 expansion. Construction of Phase 2 is estimated to cost \$3.5 to 4 million. One possible financing plan for Phase 2 is to have the next major project prepay its sewer impact fees and then if necessary seek a loan from the State Infrastructure Bank for the remainder of the funds. Other funding options can be explored, including debt financing through the sale of bonds.

The Phase 2 expansion project can be accommodated during the housing element planning period; however, the timing will be dependent on the construction of a large project such as Winters Highlands. This occurs because wastewater impact fees are used to finance expansion activities. Expansion of the wastewater treatment facility is paid for by future development.

Public Services

As described in more detail in the Public Services and Facilities Element, the provision of public services to newly developing areas in Winters will require expansion of facilities. Water, sewer, drainage, police, fire, parks, schools and transportation will require improvements in capacity to treat and distribute water, to treat sewage, to handle run-off and provide sufficient space and capacity for recreation, public safety, education and movement of people and goods. In each case, the cost of expansion will most likely be financed through development fees, exactions, assessment districts or some combination of these. These costs will be passed on to homebuyers, who will pay for the expansions over time. While these costs will increase the cost of housing, there is no other way for the City to finance these improvements.

CONSTRAINTS

The purpose of this section is to identify those governmental and non-governmental factors unique to the community that inhibit the development, maintenance, or improvement of housing. The governmental constraints analysis focuses on factors that are within the City's control, not on state, federal, or other governmental policies or regulations that Winters cannot affect or modify. There are many such policies and regulations that could affect the City's ability to meet future housing needs and secure adequate funding to construct very low- and low-income housing. Among these other governmental constraints are:

- Land use and environmental policies and regulations that could limit the City's ability to designate land within its planning area for future residential development. Examples include agricultural open space and natural habitat preservation; protection of endangered species; and flood control.
- Fiscal and financial constraints related to regional, state or federal funding for housing, transportation, infrastructure, and services needed to support new residential development.
- State and federal requirements that add to the cost of constructing affordable housing, when public funds are used (such as so called "prevailing wage" requirements).
- Construction codes and regulations that Winters must follow for new residential construction that could restrict the use of cost-saving techniques or materials.

While these other governmental requirements meet legitimate public purposes, Winters recognizes that they can potentially constrain the availability and affordability of housing to meet the community's future needs.

NON-GOVERNMENTAL CONSTRAINTS

Land Costs

Table 43 provides information for single-family and multifamily residential vacant lots for sale and existing multifamily structures for sale in the City of Winters and surrounding Cities (March-May 2002). The acreages of the lots range from .13 to 6.4 acres. No multi-family residential projects were found to be for sale in Winters as of this date. Furthermore, the last residential subdivision project (Carter Ranch Phase II) was completed in 2003.

Table 43**Land and Existing Structure Costs**

City	Acres	Cost	Cost Per Acre	Type
Vacant Land				
Winters	0.17 acres/1 unit	\$75,000	\$75,000	SF Residential
Winters	0.16 acres/1 unit	\$75,000	\$75,000	SF Residential
Winters	0.13 acres/1 unit	\$75,000	\$75,000	SF Residential
Winters	4.50 acres/67 units	\$1,300,000	\$288,888	Multifamily
Citrus Heights	6.40 acres/96 units	\$1,200,000	\$187,500	Multifamily
Existing Structures				
City	Units	Cost	Cost Per Unit	Type
Vacaville	8	\$625,000	\$78,125	Multifamily
Vacaville	4	\$360,000	\$90,000	Multifamily
Vacaville	23	\$1,900,000	\$82,608	Multifamily
Sacramento	90	\$6,100,000	\$67,777	Multifamily

Source: Loopnet, March -May 2002.

Construction and Labor Costs

Many factors can affect the cost of building a house, including the type of construction, materials, site conditions, finishing details, amenities, and structural configuration. In 2002, total construction costs per square foot, excluding land costs, ranged from \$70 to \$95 for single-family construction, depending on the quality and amenities of the home. The cost of raw land was estimated to be \$75,000 for a 5,000 square foot lot. In 2002, homes in the Carter Ranch Subdivision were selling in the low \$200,000 (1,600 square foot house) to mid \$300,000 (2,300 square foot house). Marketing and Administrative costs are running about 10 percent of the sales price while financing is running about 2-3 percent of the sales price.

An internet source of construction cost data (www.building-cost.net), provided by Craftsman Book Company, estimated (in November 2004) the cost of single-story 2,000 square foot home with a 480 square foot garage in the Winters area at \$164,956. This figure does not include land costs

In recent years there have been few multifamily developments constructed in the City therefore our multifamily construct costs are based on developments in near by cities. A local developer who recently constructed a 138-unit apartment complex with a community building in the near by community of South Sacramento provided the following information regarding multi-family construction costs. The developer estimated that construction costs excluding land are about \$97 per square foot. The size of the lot on this project was 9.6 acres and was appraised at \$540,000. Another project produced by the same developer in the City of Davis was a 30-unit senior complex with mostly 1 bedroom units. The construction costs for this project excluding land was about \$89 per square foot. The size of the lot on this project was 2.9 acres and was appraised at \$550,000.

The Cost and Availability of Financing

The City has not identified local constraints to the availability or cost of financing for home purchases or rehabilitation that differ significantly from the availability or cost of financing generally in California. Even in the City's older neighborhoods, there are no barriers to obtaining financing for home purchase, improvement, or construction (other than customary underwriting considerations by lenders).

The primary factor related to home finance affecting housing affordability and availability is the cost of borrowing money (interest rates). Historically, substantial changes in interest rates have correlated with swings in home sales. When interest rates decline, sales increase. The reverse has been true when interest rates increase. Over the past two decades, there has been a dramatic growth in alternative mortgage products, such as graduated mortgages and variable rate mortgages. These types of loans allow homeowners to take advantage of lower initial interest rates and qualify for larger home loans. Even during periods of high interest rates, these alternative products allow more buyers to qualify for homeownership, thus minimizing the swings in home sales that accompany changes in interest rates.

Nevertheless, the fixed interest rate mortgage remains the preferred type of loan, especially during periods of low, stable interest rates. Most governmental programs that seek to increase homeownership among low- and moderate-income households rely on loan products that provide fixed interest rates below prevailing market rates, either for the principal loan or for a second loan that provides part of the down payment for home purchase. Many programs offer deferred second loans to facilitate homeownership. Table 44 shows various monthly payments necessary to service mortgages at various interest rates. Financing is currently available at 5.44 percent (www.bankrate.com, December 2004).

Table 44

Monthly Payments and Total Interest at Various Interest Rates

Interest Rate	15-Year Loan			30-Year Loan		
	Payment per \$10k	Total Interest Paid	Percent Difference Payment/Interest	Payment per \$10k	Total Interest Paid	Percent Difference Payment/Interest
5.5%	\$81.71	\$4,708	--	\$56.78	\$10,440	--
6%	\$84.39	\$5189	3.28%/10.22%	\$59.96	\$11,584	5.60%/10.96%
7%	\$89.88	\$6179	6.51%/19.08%	\$66.53	\$13,951	10.96%/20.43%
8%	\$95.57	\$7202	6.33%/16.56%	\$73.38	\$16,416	10.30%/15.02%

Source: www.bankrate.com, December 2004.

GOVERNMENTAL CONSTRAINTS

Governmental constraints include land use controls, building codes and their enforcement, site improvements, fees, exactions required of developers, and local processing and permit procedures. Land use controls may limit the amount or density of development, while building codes may set specific building standards that add material costs or limit building space on a site, thus increasing the cost of housing per unit.

Land Use Controls

The City's General Plan and zoning ordinance regulate land use in Winters. All residential land use classifications pose a constraint residential development in the sense that various conditions, building requirements, and limitations restrict a pure free market ability to construct housing. Land use regulations also have the potential of adding costs to construction, which indirectly may constrain housing. These impacts are measured against the general health and public safety served in the adoption of such regulations. Standards have been determined by the City to establish minimum constraints in order to provide for adequate separation of buildings for fire protection, air and light between structures, and the intensity of development. Implementation of these standards has not resulted in a serious constraint in providing housing to the various income levels.

Table 43 provides a summary of Winters' residential zoning regulations, including minimum lot area, maximum density, setback, height, and parking requirements for single- and multi-family residential districts. The following is a description of the residential districts in the City and the allowable densities.

1. *General Agricultural (A-1)*. Designates areas to preserve lands best suited for agricultural use, from rangeland, field crops, orchards, greenhouses, and single-family dwellings on a minimum lot size of five acres.
2. *Rural Residential (R-R)*. Intended for rural homes with limited agricultural uses. Density ranges from 0.5 to 1 unit per acre.
3. *Single-Family, 7,000 Square Foot Average Minimum (R-1)*. Intended to stabilize and protect the residential characteristics of existing and planned neighborhoods developed with smaller lots to promote the development of single-family homes. Density ranges from 1.1 to 6.2 units per acre.
4. *Single-Family, 6,000 Square Foot Average Minimum (R-2)*. Intended to be used for single-family attached and detached homes. Duplexes may be allowed on appropriate corner lots. Density ranges from 6.3 to 7.3 units per acre.
5. *Single and Multi-Family Residential (R-3)*. Intended to provide a mix of compatible residential land uses where single- and multi-family dwellings occur at varying degrees of density. Density ranges from 6.1 to 10.0 units per acre.
6. *High Density Multi-Family Residential (R-4)*. Intended to provide for high-density multi-family residential units and similar compatible uses. Density ranges from 10.0 to 20.0 units per acre.

In addition to the above residential zones, the Winters' Zoning Ordinance permits residential uses in non-residential zones through a conditional use permit process (Section 8-1.4205 Winters Zoning Ordinance).

1. Multi-family dwellings are conditionally allowed in the following zones:
 - *Neighborhood Commercial (C-1)*
 - *Central Business District (C-2)*
 - *Office (O-F)*
2. Single-family dwellings are conditionally allowed in the following zone:
 - *Open Space (OS)*

The past project densities for affordable multi-family projects have ranged from 10.97 to 17.76 dwelling units per acre for the High Density Multi-Family Residential (R-4) zone. The maximum

density for R-4 is 20 units/acre. Past densities for affordable multi-family projects will likely not be adequate to facilitate sufficient production of affordable housing. Future affordable multi-family projects will need to be constructed at the upper one-quarter of the R-4 density range and may require density bonuses in some instances. Implementation Program II.8. has been revised to encourage development in the upper one-quarter of the R-3 and R-4 density ranges and to have the City provide non-financial incentives and consider where a financing gap can be documented financial incentives for affordable multi-family projects. The non-financial incentives may cover such aspects as reduced street standards, setback requirements, parking standards, and lot coverage requirements.

Homeless shelters are permitted in the Multi-Family Residential (R-3), High Density Multi-Family Residential (R-4), Central Business District (C-2), and Public/Quasi Public (PQP) zoning districts with a conditional use permit. The Zoning Ordinance will be revised to allow transitional and farmworker housing in R-3 and R-4 zones with a conditional use permit; Implementation Program II.7. addresses transitional and farmworker housing.

Conditional Use Permit Process

The conditional use permit process is described in the City's Zoning Ordinance under Article 4, Section 8-1.4205 (Use Permits). In granting a use permit, the Planning Commission or Zoning Administrator, must find all of the following general conditions to be fulfilled by the requested use:

- use will be in conformity with the General Plan;
- use is listed as a conditional use in the zone regulations or elsewhere in Section 8-1.4205 of the Zoning Ordinance, or, where an interpretation is necessary, a determination is made by the Community Development Director or Planning Commission that proposed use would require a use permit;
- use is consistent with the intent and purposes of the zone in which it is located, and will not detrimentally impact the character of the neighborhood;
- use will not be detrimental to the public health, safety or general welfare;
- adequate utilities, access roads, drainage, sanitation and/or other necessary facilities or services will be provided;
- use will not create a nuisance or enforcement problem within the neighborhood; and
- use will not result in a negative fiscal impact upon the City.

CUPs For Multi-Family Projects

The City of Winters' Zoning Ordinance lists multi-family projects as conditional uses (conditional use permit required) for R-3 (Multi-Family Residential Zone) and R-4 (High Density Multi-Family Residential Zone) Zones. For a multi-family project, the CUP process is used to ensure that the project meets the minimum standards of the Zoning Ordinance such as parking, setback, and building height requirements; the project will provide the appropriate mix of one, two, three, and four bedroom units to address seniors and large families; and the project will have public input. In addition, for density bonus projects, the CUP process will serve as the forum for determining what incentives will be provided to the project. As part of a comprehensive review of the Zoning Ordinance, City Staff will initiate a discussion with the Planning Commission and City Council on whether multi-family projects should be reviewed at a staff level discretionary review.

Processing Time For Multi-Family Project CUP

The Senior Apartments project in 1994 was the last multi-family project constructed in Winters (other than a mixed used rehabilitation project that resulted in six studio apartments restricted to low-income households being created on the second floor of the Cradwick Building and three commercial spaces being created on the first floor). A CUP was not filed for the Senior Apartments project – only a site plan application was filed for the project. The planning process (from the initial submittal of an application to the Planning Commission's approval of the project) took less than four months.

Permitted Uses in Residential Zoning Districts

The Winters Municipal Zoning Ordinance designates permitted and non-permitted uses for all developable use types in the City in relation to the City's zoning categories (Table 45).

Table 45

City of Winters Residential Zoning Requirements with Allowable Residential Development

	A-1 General Agricultural	R-R Rural Residential	R-1 7,000 SF Average Minimum	R-2 6,000 SF Average Minimum	R-3 Multi-Family Residential	R-4 High Density Multi-Family Residential
Minimum Lot Area (square feet)	5 Acres	1 Acre	6,000 ¹	5,000 ¹	6,000 SF 10,000 MF	10,000
Maximum Density (units per gross acre)	1 unit per 5 acres	.5 to 1 unit per acre	1.1 to 7.3	5.4 to 8.8	6.1 to 10.0	10.1 to 20.0
Minimum Lot Width or Depth (feet)	300	100	60 corner lots +10	50 corner lots +10	60 SF 80 MF	80
Alley Setback (feet)	5	5	5	5	5	5
Minimum Front Yard Setback (feet)	25 ²	25	20 15 for front patios	20 15 for front patios	20 ² 15 for front patios	20 ² 15 for front patios
Minimum Side Yard Setback (feet)	20	15	5/10 ³	5/10 ³	5/10 ³	5/10 ³
Minimum Rear Yard Setback (feet)	15	25	25	20	20	10
Secondary Frontage (feet) ⁴	20	20	15	15	20	20
Height Limit (Dwellings) (feet)	45 non-residential 30 residential	30	30	30	35	45
Maximum Site Coverage	N/A	N/A	50% for single story 45% for two story	50% for single story 45% for two story	60%	70%

	A-1 General Agricultural	R-R Rural Residential	R-1 7,000 SF Average Minimum	R-2 6,000 SF Average Minimum	R-3 Single and Multi- Family Residential	R-4 High Density Multi-Family Residential
PARKING REQUIREMENTS						
	N/A	N/A	2 spaces per unit (1 covered or enclosed)	2 space per unit (1 covered or enclosed)	≤ 1 bedroom 1 space/unit .25 spaces/unit guest parking ⁵	≥ 2 bedrooms 2 spaces/unit .25 spaces/unit guest parking ⁵
PERMITTED USES						
Single-family Dwellings	Permitted Use	Permitted Use	Permitted Use	Permitted Use	Conditional Use	Conditional Use
Two-family Duplex ⁶	Not Permitted	Not Permitted	Permitted Use	Permitted Use	Conditional Use	Conditional Use
Multi-family dwellings of three or more	Not Permitted	Not Permitted	Not Permitted	Not Permitted	Conditional Use	Conditional Use
Second Residential Units	Not Permitted	Conditional Use	Conditional Use	Conditional Use	Conditional Use	Conditional Use
Mobile Home Parks	Not Permitted	Conditional Use	Conditional Use	Conditional Use	Conditional Use	Conditional Use
Emergency Shelters	Not Permitted	Not Permitted	Not Permitted	Not Permitted	Conditional Use	Conditional Use
Transitional Housing	Not Permitted	Not Permitted	Not Permitted	Not Permitted	Not Permitted ⁷	Not Permitted ⁶
Convalescence and Care Services	Not Permitted	Conditional Use	Conditional Use	Conditional Use	Conditional Use	Conditional Use
Day Care, General ⁸	Not Permitted	Conditional Use	Conditional Use	Conditional Use	Conditional Use	Conditional Use
Day Care, Limited ⁹	Not Permitted	Permitted Use	Permitted Use	Permitted Use	Permitted Use	Permitted Use

Source: City of Winters Zoning Ordinance, 2003.

¹Lot sizes for detached split lot duplex affordable housing units shall be a minimum of 3,500 square feet in the R-1 Zone and a minimum of 3,000 square feet in the R-2 Zone. Lot sizes for detached or attached market rate split lot duplexes shall be a minimum 13,500 square feet in the R-1 Zone and 11,500 square feet in the R-2 Zone. Duplexes or split lot duplexes are allowed only on corner lots.

²These zones require an additional 1 foot setback for all yards for each 1 foot of building/structure height over 30 feet. Where the zone may not require an ally, side or rear yard setback, a minimum setback of 20 feet shall be required for any building/structure over 30 feet in height.

³Where a combination of stories occurs, the 10 foot setback shall be situated on the 2-story side. For single-story residences, the 10 foot setback shall be on the garage side.

⁴Add 5 feet if lot is located on a major arterial.

⁵At least 50 percent of the required spaces shall be covered or enclosed, with a minimum of one covered or enclosed space provided per unit.

⁶For a two-family duplex, 1.5 spaces per unit.

⁷As part of the 2002 Housing Element update, the City will add a policy to the programs section to amend the City's Zoning Ordinance to allow, through a conditional use permit process, transitional housing in the R-3 and R-4 districts.

⁸Providing non-medical care and supervision of seven or more persons on a less than twenty-four hour a day basis. The use includes childcare operations.

⁹Providing non-medical care and supervision of six or fewer persons on a less than twenty-four hour a day basis. The use includes childcare operations.

Building Codes

Building Codes regulate the physical construction of dwellings and include plumbing, electrical, and mechanical divisions. The purpose of the Building Code and its enforcement is to protect the public from unsafe conditions associated with construction. The City of Winters enforces the State Building Code Standards (Title 24) for existing units, new construction, and residential rehabilitation. State law affords local government some flexibility when adopting the uniform codes; the building codes can be amended based on geographical, topological or climatological considerations. Further, State Housing law provides that local building departments can authorize the use of materials and construction methods other than those specified in the uniform code if the proposed design is found to be satisfactory and the materials or methods are at least equivalent to that prescribed by the building codes.

A review of the City's amendments to the uniform codes indicates that they have no substantial impact on the cost of residential development. Winters' amendments to the State Building Code standards are primarily procedural and administrative, such as filing procedures, and to enforce safety procedures in dangerous or unsafe buildings.

Development Fees

Winters charges a number of permit and development impact fees to cover the cost of processing development requests and providing public facilities and services to new developments. Although these fees are necessary to meet City service standards, they can have a substantial impact on the cost of housing, particularly affordable housing. In creating a development fee structure, the City of Winters carefully balanced the need to offset the cost of public services with a level of fees that do not inhibit residential development.

Normally, Planning fees would have a minimal impact on housing cost because most fees are flat rate charges, not per unit charges, and can be spread over the entire development. For a modest-sized development proposal, permit fees would typically amount to a few hundred dollars per dwelling unit.

Building, Engineering, and Development Impact fees have a much larger effect than planning fees on the final cost of a home. Such fees include water and sewer impact and hook-up costs, park fees, traffic impact fees, and similar charges. Table 46 lists the building and development costs for a single-family unit in a subdivision zoned Medium Density Residential (R-2 Zone) with a livable area of 1,850 square feet, including a 500-square foot garage. For this example, the valuation is based on rates of \$68 per square foot for the residence and \$20 per square foot for the garage for a total construction valuation of \$135,800.

Table 46

Building Permit and Development Impact Fees

Permit/Development Fee	Amount
Building Permit	1,195.35
Plumbing Permit	269.07
Electrical Permit	209.30
Mechanical Permit	149.54

Permit/Development Fee	Amount
CARF	100
Plan Check and Reinspection	776.98
Energy Plan Check	58.27
CD and Public Safety Supplement	2,308.60
Strong Motion	13.58
Metered Construction Water	149.38
Water Service Impact Fee	3,359
Wastewater System Impact fee	5,581
General Storm Drain Impact Fee	44
Streets & Highways Impact Fee	7,053
Public Safety Impact Fee	956
Fire Service Impact Fee	1,452
Parks & Recreation Impact Fee	3,596
Monitoring fee	1,004
General Capital Impact Fee	2,132
Non Flood Study Area Impact Fee	185
Fire System Fee	234
GRAND TOTAL	\$30,826.07

Source: City of Winters, November 2004.

Table 47 lists details on City fees for the construction of a 56-unit multi-family development based on an average unit size of 950 square feet, a construction valuation of \$3,617,600, and high density residential (General Plan land use designation) impact fees. This example does not include the construction valuation for the garages, storage units, swimming pool, and community room that may be incorporated into the project. The valuation of this project is based on rates of \$68 per square foot for the dwelling units.

Table 47

Multi-Family Development Building Permit and Development Impact Fees

Permit/Development Fee	Amount
Building Permit	15,164.45
Plumbing Permit	3,062.89
Electrical Permit	2,304.67
Mechanical Permit	1,546.45
CARF	150
Plan Check and Reinspection	9,856.89
Energy Plan Check	739.27
CD and Public Safety Supplement	61,499.20

Strong Motion	361.76
Metered Construction Water	3,979.36
Water Service Impact Fee	92,176
Wastewater System Impact fee	164,080
General Storm Drain Impact Fee	1,288
Streets & Highways Impact Fee	246,848
Public Safety Impact Fee	126,560
Fire Service Impact Fee	50,792
Parks & Recreation Impact Fee	125,832
Monitoring fee	53,200
General Capital Impact Fee	74,760
Non Flood Study Area Impact Fee	2,800
Park In-Lieu Fee	50,400
Fire System Fee (Based on seven risers)	1,638
Grand Total	\$1,089,038.94

Source: City of Winters, November 2004.

School Impact Fees

The Winters Joint Unified School District impact fee for both single-family and multi-family development is \$3.16 per square foot.

Yolo County Impact Fees

The Yolo County impact fee applies to both single family and multi-family developments. There is one single-family impact fee of \$1,845.80 per unit. There are two multi-family fees. The first one is based on a project of 2 to 4 units and the fee rate is \$1,417.90 per unit while the second one is based on a project of 5 or more units and the fee is \$1,095.60 per unit.

Planning Fees

Table 48 lists fees charged by the City of Winters for the processing of various land use permits.

Table 48

Planning Fees

Process	Amount Charged
Conditional Use Permit	\$1,300
Special Use Permit	\$900
Rezoning/Zoning Amendment	\$1,920 + 125% of consultant's costs
Variance	\$1,140

Prezoning (annexation)	\$1,920 + 125% of consultant's costs + LAFCO costs
General Plan Amendment	\$1,920 + 125% of consultant's costs
Initial Study (environmental review)	\$400 + 125% of consultant's costs
Negative Declaration	\$1,000
Draft Environmental Impact Report	\$125% of consultant's costs
Parcel Map	\$800 + \$30 per lot + 125% of consultant's costs
Tentative Subdivision Map (subdivisions 5 lots+)	\$1,800 + \$30 per lot + 125% of consultant's costs
Final Subdivision Map	\$1,500 + \$30 per lot + 125% of consultant's costs
Lot Line Adjustment/Lot Split	\$300
Site Plan Review	\$500
Modification to Tentative, Final Maps or conditions	\$1,200 + 125% of consultant's costs
Appeals	\$200

Source: City of Winters, November 2004.

On and Off-site Improvement Requirements

When new developments are constructed there is a need to improve the land upon which the development is located, or provide improvements in the general area to properly serve the development. These improvements vary depending on whether the development is located on raw land or an infill site. Typical raw land improvements include the installation of sewers, curbs, gutters, and streets. Many infill sites are already equipped with some if not most improvements, particularly streets. Therefore, there are usually no dedication or easement requirements on such sites. Land improvements require fees, some of which are listed above. The cost of improvements depends upon the extent of improvements, the size of the project, and accessibility.

Typical improvements required on site in the City of Winters include the following:

1. Water: mains, laterals, meters, fire hydrants
2. Sewer: mains, laterals, cleanouts
3. Streets: pavement, curb, gutter, sidewalk, lights
4. Storm Drain: storm drain lines and inlets

The above are the basic requirements. Some requirements are unique to a particular project and could involve one or more of the following:

1. Detention basin for storm water
2. Sewer lift station
3. Traffic signal
4. Soundwall (for noise mitigation) and landscaping
5. Park construction
6. Water well

Offsite infrastructure improvements could involve one or more of the following:

1. Sewer lift station

2. Expansion of wastewater treatment facilities
3. Traffic signal
4. Detention basin for storm water
5. Construction off sewer mains off site
6. Water well

The above lists are not exhaustive, but are some of the more basic, obvious infrastructure requirements and the City believes that these do not present a constraint to the production of affordable housing.

Permit Processing Procedures

The City of Winters meets state-required timelines for the approval of development permits, as shown below in Table 49. The time required for development approval is not generally a constraint or substantial cost to housing developers. An overly lengthy review process, however, could adversely affect an affordable housing project if the time required to obtain approval affects the proponent's ability to access funding for the project (particularly governmental grants). In such cases, expedited permit review could provide an additional level of certainty that the amount of time required for project approval will not adversely affect the developer's ability to access funding.

Table 49

Application Processing Times

Application Type	Estimated Approval Time Period
General Plan Amendment	24 weeks
Rezoning	24 weeks
Use Permit	6 weeks
Variance	6 weeks
Building Permit	2-3 weeks
Design Review (staff level)	30 days
Design Review	6 weeks
Planned Development	24 weeks
Minor Subdivision (Tentative Map)	24 weeks
Major Subdivision (Tentative Map)	52 weeks
Minor Subdivision (Final Map)	Variable
Major Subdivision (Final Map)	Variable

Source: City of Winters, November 2004.

Permit Processing Procedures for Multi-family Projects

The following is a list of the permit processing procedure (conditional use permit) for multi-family.

Day 1 Project application (conditional use permit/site plan review) submitted.

Day 1 – 30

Staff reviews application and must provide the applicant with a completeness determination (letter) within 30 calendar days. Generally, the following items would need to be submitted with the application and staff would review the application to ensure these items are included and each individual submittal is complete:

1. Site Plan

The site plan should show the following (but some items may not be applicable for a specific project):

- Dimension property lines and all building setbacks.
- Location, name, and width (including required widening) of adjacent streets.
- The name, location, and width of water courses (if any).
- Show on-site and off-site ground elevations to determine directions of drainage and compliance with the Flood Damage Prevention Control Ordinance.
- Existing and proposed public and private easements.
- All proposed improvements and existing improvements, which will be retained.
- Dimensioned parking spaces and aisles. Show that 50% of the parking area will be shaded.
- Access and circulation of pedestrians and vehicles.
- Walls, fences, and exterior lighting structures.
- Planted areas and outdoor use areas. List types of trees, shrubs, etc.
- Location, size, and type of signs.
- Location of trash enclosures.
- Location, type, trunk and canopy diameter, and status (e.g. to be removed, saved, etc.) of all existing trees (if any) over 3" trunk diameter.
- Vicinity map showing location of the project within Winters.

2. Traffic Analysis

3. Soils (Geotechnical) Study

4. Cultural Resources Survey

5. Biological Survey

6. Phase I Environmental Site Assessment

There may be other requirements such as special infrastructure studies, but these are site-specific.

Day 30	Staff issues completeness determination and begins work on Initial Study.
Day 30 – 45	Staff completes Initial Study and Negative Declaration and starts circulating draft Negative Declaration on Day 45 for a minimum of 20 days to regulatory agencies and other interested parties. This assumes that project will not require any mitigations.
Day 70	Staff notices (300-foot mailing and newspaper public notice advertisement) Planning Commission public hearing on conditional use permit (including site plan review) for Day 90.
Day 90	Planning Commission public hearing held on project. Planning Commission continues public hearing to Day 120.
Day 120	Continued public hearing held before the Planning Commission and the Commission approves the project.

The above list makes a number of assumptions:

1. The applicant and staff meet a number of times before submittal of the application.
2. The applicant provides a complete application and may need to work with staff to adjust the project before it is initially reviewed and considered by the Planning Commission.
3. There aren't significant environmental issues that would require a mitigated negative declaration.
4. The Planning Commission's approval of the project isn't appealed to the City Council.

As part of a comprehensive review of the Zoning Ordinance, City Staff will initiate a discussion with the Planning Commission and City Council on whether multi-family projects below a certain unit threshold shall be exempted from the CUP requirement.

Constraints to Housing Persons with Disabilities

Many persons with disabilities require special housing accommodations for on-site supportive services, group living, accessibility, or shared housing arrangements. Areas of the City zoned for multi-family housing and other classifications that permit alternative types of housing for persons with disabilities are generally located with access to public transit, commercial and public services, and sidewalks and street crossing compliant with State and Federal handicapped accessibility standards. The City ensures that new housing developments comply with the Uniform Building Code, California building standards (Title 24 of the California Code of Regulations), and Federal Americans with Disabilities Act requirements for accessibility.

General

The City provides reasonable accommodations for persons with disabilities in the enforcement of building codes and the issuance of building permits as consistent with the accessibility design and construction standards contained in the Uniform Building Code and the California Building Code. The conditional use permit process, which is described in detail under the next section (Zoning and Land Use), provides a process for individuals with disabilities to make requests for reasonable accommodations with respect to zoning. The process for requesting a reasonable accommodation begins with the applicant contacting the Community Development Department to discuss the particular situation or submitting a written request. Depending on the nature of the request, the request may be consistent with the applicable zoning, permit processing, and building laws. Where there is an inconsistency, the applicant may need to seek relief through a variance or other procedure.

The City has received grant funds on three different occasions for owner-occupied rehabilitation programs. In its advertising for these programs, the City has noted that ADA retrofit work is an eligible cost. The City has not advertised information about requesting a reasonable accommodation with respect to zoning, permit processing, or building laws. The City of Winters will, as part of the policies for the 2002 Housing Element update, establish an ordinance to require that new residential subdivisions incorporate universal design features into a portion of the single-family residences to assist persons with disabilities.

Zoning and Land Use

A review of the City's Zoning Ordinance and related policies and practices does not show the City to be out of compliance with Fair Housing Laws as it pertains to the development, maintenance, and improvement of housing for persons with disabilities. Residential parking standards for persons with disabilities are not different from other parking standards. When a special needs project proponent requests a reduction in parking requirements and can demonstrate a reduced need for parking, the request would likely be addressed through either a planned development overlay or a variance.

Group homes (or residential care facilities) of six or fewer persons are permitted by right on the same basis as other single-family uses. Single-family uses are permitted by right in the General Agriculture (A-1), Rural Residential (R-R), Single Family 7,000 Square Foot Average Minimum (R-1), and Single Family 6,000 Square Foot Average Minimum (R-2) zones. Single-family uses are conditionally allowed in Multi-Family Residential (R-3), High Density Multi-Family Residential (R-4), and Open Space (O-S) zones. Group homes over six persons are conditionally allowed in the R-R, R-1, R-2, R-3, R-4, and PQP (Public/Quasi Public) zones. While a conditional use permit (CUP) is required for a group home over six persons, the conditional use process does not add significantly to the financial and regulatory burden of locating a group home. A \$900 fee is charged for a conditional use permit. The CUP process seeks to ensure the suitability and adequacy of the site for the proposed use; adequate utilities and infrastructure are available on-site, and compatibility of design with adjacent uses within the district and its surroundings.

The City's Zoning Ordinance does not have occupancy standards that apply specifically to unrelated adults. The City's General Plan land use element does not require a minimum distance between two (or more) special needs housing facilities.

Permits and Process

As noted earlier, group homes (or residential care facilities) of six or fewer persons are permitted by right on the same basis as other single-family uses – no special permits are required. Single-family

uses are permitted by right in the General Agriculture (A-1), Rural Residential (R-R), Single Family 7,000 Square Foot Average Minimum (R-1), and Single Family 6,000 Square Foot Average Minimum (R-2) zones. Single-family uses are conditionally allowed in Multi-Family Residential (R-3), High Density Multi-Family Residential (R-4), and Open Space (O-S) zones. Group homes over six persons are conditionally allowed in the R-R, R-1, R-2, R-3, R-4, and PQP zones. While a conditional use permit is required for a group home over six persons, the conditional use process does not add significantly to the financial and regulatory burden of locating a group home. A \$900 fee is charged for a conditional use permit. The CUP process seeks to ensure the suitability and adequacy of the site for the proposed use; adequate utilities and infrastructure are available on-site, and compatibility of design with adjacent uses within the district and its surroundings.

The City's role in processing a request to retrofit a private home for accessibility will likely be limited to reviewing the property owner's plans to determine whether a building permit is required and referring the property owner to the California Disabled Accessibility Guidebook or California Building Code for information on accessibility standards. In most instances, a building permit will not be required for accessibility retrofit work. For example, the addition of grab bars in a shower area would not require a building permit. Changing out an existing shower and replacing it with a handicap accessible one would require a plumbing permit if the plumbing needs to be altered.

A conditional use permit (CUP) is required when a group home of six or fewer persons is proposed for R-3, R-4, and O-S zones or when a group home of six or more persons is proposed. The filing of a CUP requires the mailing of a public hearing notice to all property owners within 300-feet of the project site, the publishing of the notice in the local newspaper, and a public hearing. The public is given an opportunity to comment on the proposed project at the public hearing or submit comments on the project prior to or at the hearing. The public input process allowed for the approval of group homes is not different from the public input process allowed for a subdivision, parcel map, variance, or master plan. The City has not established particular conditions for group homes that will be providing services on-site.

Building Codes

The City has adopted the California Building Code, 2001 edition. The City has not made any amendments that might diminish its ability to accommodate persons with disabilities nor has it locally adopted any universal design elements in the building code. As noted earlier, the City provides reasonable accommodations for persons with disabilities in the enforcement of building codes and the issuance of building permits as consistent with the accessibility design and construction standards contained in the Uniform Building Code and the California Building Code. One of the proposed implementation programs includes the preparation of an ordinance that would incorporate universal design features in single-family residences.

Example of Care Home for Elderly

On May 6, 1997, the City received a conditional use permit (CUP) application from Our Lady of Perpetual Help to increase the number of elderly patients served at the residential care home, a single-family residence, from six to eight. The care home is located was located in an R-2 zone (and is now located in an R-1 zone) and is surrounded by single-family residences. The Planning Commission held a public hearing on May 27, 1997 and continued the public hearing to June 24, 1997. The Commission approved the CUP at its second meeting. In its approval of the CUP, the CUP, the Commission made the following requirements that are specific to the project site:

1. Installation of a water meter and water billed at a commercial/business rate.

2. Raise existing sanitary sewer or install sanitary sewer cleanout.

The CUP process was used to notify the public of the proposed changes in the operation of the care home and provided the Commission with an opportunity to require improvements that were consistent with the impacts of the proposed projects.

Example of Residential Care Home for Developmentally Disabled Adults

This facility did not require Planning Commission approval since state law allows such a facility without local government approval as long as the facility serves six or fewer clients. However, the Commission did consider a request in 1996 to construct a common doorway between two dwelling units, a duplex, for the proposed care home. The Commission approved the doorway and the matter was appealed to the City Council. The Council denied the appeal and affirmed the Commission's decision.

Second Unit Requirements

The City of Winters Zoning Ordinance permits secondary housing units as a conditional use in any R-District on any lot subject to Planning Commission's approval (Section 8-1.5307); however, because of a change in State Law, City Staff is no longer enforcing the conditional use permit requirement. One of the proposed implementation programs includes a revision of the Zoning Ordinance second unit requirements to reflect changes in State Law.

The maximum area of floor space of any second unit should not exceed 1,200 square feet of living area on lots with a net lot area of 20,000 square feet or greater, and 750 square feet of living area on lots with a net lot area of less than 20,000 square feet. A second unit may be attached or detached from the principal unit. The site on which the proposed second unit is to be located must meet the minimum lot size requirements for the zone in which it is located, and in no instance is less than 7,000 square feet. The second unit must be located on the same lot in which the owner maintains his or her primary place of residence, with either the secondary unit or principal unit being owner occupied. Only one (1) second unit will be permitted for each principle residence per lot, and will be occupied by a maximum of two people. One off-street parking space will be provided for every second unit, in addition to parking required for the principal residence. The second unit must comply with all current zoning requirements, including structure height and yard setbacks. Consistent with the General Plan, second units will be encouraged to front on alleys and not be constructed forward of the line of the principle residence. A proposed implementation program includes waiving all or a portion of the impact fees for secondary housing units in exchange for an affordable housing deed restriction.

Manufactured Home and Mobile Home Park Standards

A manufactured home or a mobile home located outside a mobile home park shall conform to all of the residential use development standards for the zoning district in which it is located. Where manufactured homes are placed in residential districts, the mobile home is required to be attached to a permanent solid foundation system in conformance with state law and approved by the City. The City's Zoning Ordinance (Section 8-1.6008 A) prohibits mobile homes in the Main Street Historic District. Development standards for mobile home parks include, but are not limited to the following:

- minimum area of five acres;
- minimum of 50 mobile home sites;
- density not to exceed the density range in the district;

- two parking spaces are to be provided per unit; and
- enclosed by a masonry wall 6 feet in height.

Parking Requirements

Table 50 provides information on residential off-street parking requirements, subject to Section 8-1.6003 of the City's Zoning Ordinance.

Table 50

Residential Parking Requirements

Residential Land Use	Off-Street Spaces Required
Single-Family ¹	2 per unit 1 must be covered or enclosed
Two-Family/Duplex ¹	1.5 per unit
Multi-Family ²	
≤ 1 Bedroom	1 per unit
≥ 2 Bedrooms	2 per unit
Guest	.25 per unit
Mobile Home Park	2 per mobile home
Guest	.25 per unit

Source: City of Winters Zoning Ordinance, 2003.

¹Requires in-kind replacement when a garage or carport space is converted to another use.

²At least 50 percent of the required spaces must be covered or enclosed, with a minimum of one covered or enclosed space provided per unit.

Design Review

The design review process for the City of Winters is intended to ensure that the location and configuration of structures and corollary site improvements are visually harmonious with their site and that of surrounding sites and structures. The design review process includes an analysis of proposed architectural styles, construction materials, colors, site landscaping, and similar development criteria. Design review is required before the Planning Commission for approval of the following residential projects:

- new construction of multi-family residential units;
- new construction of any single-family residential unit;
- modifications of existing buildings involving collectively significant exterior changes, which may include changes of building materials, addition/deletion of doors, windows and awnings, changes to rooflines or parapet walls, etc., as determined by the Community Development Director.

The Planning Commission will consider the following aspects for design review of a site plan, as applicable:

1. The overall visible mass of the structure(s). This analysis may include review of visible building mass as it relates to property setbacks, building height, roofline profiles, lot coverage, orientation, and the overall size and scale of a building.
2. The use and quality of exterior construction materials, including exterior building colors on new construction only to the extent that it may detract from the desired design theme for a neighborhood.
3. Avoidance of buildings that are characterized by large, blank or unbroken wall planes, as well as buildings that exhibit a general lack of architectural detailing, shadow lines, etc., which collectively lack general visual interest.
4. Effective screening of ground- and roof-mounted mechanical equipment.
5. The use of landscaping, decorative site paving, etc. that provides effective visual screening or softening of the development. Consideration of the appropriate mix of plant materials, plant sizes, etc. pursuant to landscaping criteria contained in Section 8-1.6004 of the City's Municipal Code.
6. Achieve conformity with the Winters Design Guidelines.
7. In addition to the above, single-family development design review will focus on avoiding the use of repetitive design and site plans. Design review is intended to encourage elements of individuality in residence design through inclusion of features such as modified front and side yard setbacks, varying architectural styles, building siding and roofing materials, and creative use of fencing and landscaping. To the extent possible, designs should also encourage pedestrian activity while reducing emphasis on vehicular access as the local point of a residential lot.

The Planning Commission will make findings relative to compliance with the above seven provisions to approve a site plan. Applicants have the option of filing conceptual (preliminary) site plans for design review in advance of formal site plan review. Conceptual design review allows for submittal of more basic site plan information for an initial review by the Planning Commission. Conceptual design review is to be considered only as an information item and is intended to provide informal feedback to an applicant, who then could consider any comments received by the Planning Commission when preparing the formal site plan.

Design Review (Site Plan Review) For Multi-Family Projects

The Winters Residential Design Guidelines impose development standards that are not contained in the City's Zoning Ordinance. Examples include the use of gables, hips, and dormers for roofs; the use of architectural asphalt shingles, concrete or clay tile, and slate or similar visual materials for roofs; and the use of roof structures and embellishments such as louvers, vents, lanterns, pinnacles, cupolas, finials, compounded fascias, parapets and eave moldings. Besides the obvious aesthetic issues, one of the goals, or perhaps the focus, of design review is to ensure that the City's small town character is preserved and enhanced. For a multi-family project, design review (site plan review) may be accomplished separately, currently with the CUP, or the design review aspect may be merged with the CUP. City staff encourages multi-family project applicants to submit concurrently for design review and a CUP. Last year, for example, the Winters Planning Commission concurrently considered the CUP and site plan (design review) for the Winters Townhomes and Apartments, a multi-family residential project with 20-percent of the units reserved for low-income households, and approved both approvals in one meeting. Similarly, the Planning Commission last year considered and approved the tentative subdivision map and site plan for the first phase of the Cottages at Carter Ranch, an affordable housing project reserved for very low-, low-, and moderate-income households, and approved both the subdivision map and site plan at the same meeting.

The use of multi-family design review has created minimal cost impact on multi-family development because the types of architectural styles and embellishments required by the City do not, by themselves, cost significantly more to construct than other types of architectural styles. The City's process for concurrent review and approval of a multifamily site plan and CUP ensures that the permit process does not add significant time or delay. As part of a comprehensive review of the Zoning Ordinance, City Staff will initiate a discussion with the Planning Commission and City Council on whether to allow a staff level review for residential projects of four units or less.

Winters Design Guidelines

The City of Winters Residential Design Guidelines was created in a joint effort by the Winter Planning Commission and Winters Economic Development Commission in November 1999. The design guidelines were developed with the specific objectives of facilitating economic and residential development in Winters and ensuring that the small town character of the City was preserved. The design guidelines include suggestions for neighborhood, circulation, residential site, and duplex design standards with design goals and visions for six physical areas or "design corridors" in the City: Interstate-505, Grant Avenue, Grant/Railroad Intersection, Railroad Avenue, Main Street, and Putah Creek. Examples of design guideline standards include, but are not limited to:

- street parkways with a variety of landscaping;
- combination of grid, cul-de-sac, and curvilinear street design;
- solar orientated street design;
- mix of large and standard lot developments;
- bikeways and pedestrian paths in new residential developments;
- variety of house types, sizes, and roof slopes on each block;
- placement of garage in the rear of the lot or orientated away from the street; and
- duplexes located on corner lots in single-family districts.

Affordable Housing Steering Committee (AHSC)

The AHSC was established in October 1994 as a citizen advisory committee in an effort to find ways to implement the City's housing policy and to involve local citizens in the process. An unofficial mission of the committee is to implement the community's housing policy in a quality way. The Committee facilitates the provision of affordable housing by working with developers to ensure that such housing is incorporated in residential projects in compliance with the City's inclusionary housing requirements.

In recent years the role of the AHSC has been to review the affordable plans for new residential projects. Last year, the AHSC met with representatives of the Winters Highlands (442 dwelling units proposed) and Callahan Estates (120 dwelling units proposed) projects to review the affordable housing component of each project. AHSC members have emphasized the need to construct affordable units within each project, spread out the affordable units throughout each project, design the affordable units so they blend in with the market rate units, and construct affordable units within each phase of a multi-phased residential project. The AHSC plays an advisory role and projects applicants do not incur any application or other fees to appear before the AHSC. The City schedules a project application before the AHSC early in the planning process to ensure affordable housing issues are resolved in a timely manner before the developer has incurred significant cost. This

committee does not have the power to alter project review, design review, or development standards. The AHSC reviews residential projects of 50 units or more.

ENERGY CONSERVATION OPPORTUNITIES

GENERAL DESIGN STANDARDS

There are many opportunities for conserving energy in new and existing homes. New buildings, by design, can easily incorporate energy efficient techniques into the construction. According to the Department of Energy, the concept of energy efficiency in buildings is the building envelope, which is everything that separates the interior of the building from the outdoor environment: the doors, windows, walls, foundation, roof, and insulation. All the components of the building envelope need to work together to keep a building warm in the winter and cool in the summer.

Constructing new homes with energy-conserving features, in addition to retrofitting existing structures, will result in a reduction in monthly utility costs. There are many ways to determine how energy efficient an existing building is and, if needed, what improvements can be made. Examples of energy conservation opportunities include installation of insulation and/or storm windows and doors, use of natural gas instead of electricity, installation or retrofitting of more efficient appliances and mechanical or solar energy systems, and building design and orientation which incorporates energy conservation considerations.

Many modern building design methods are used to reduce residential energy consumption and are based on proven techniques. These methods can be categorized in three ways:

1. Building design that keeps natural heat in during the winter and keeps natural heat out during the summer. Such design reduces air conditioning and heating demands.

Proven building techniques in this category include:

- location of windows and openings in relation to the path of the sun to minimize solar gain in the summer and maximize solar gain in the winter;
 - use of "thermal mass," earthen materials such as stone, brick, concrete, and tiles that absorb heat during the day and release heat at night;
 - use of window coverings, insulation, and other materials to reduce heat exchange between the interior of a home and the exterior;
 - location of openings and the use of ventilating devices that take advantage of natural air flow (particularly cool evening breezes);
 - use of eaves and overhangs that block direct solar gain through window openings during the summer but allow solar gain during the winter; and
 - zone heating and cooling systems, which reduce heating and cooling in the unused areas of a home.
2. Building orientation that uses natural forces to maintain a comfortable interior temperature. Examples include:
 - solar orientation of residences to facilitate the use of solar energy systems for heating and cooling;
 - minimizing the eastern and western exposure of exterior surfaces; and



- location of dwellings to take advantage of natural air circulation and evening breezes.
3. Use of landscaping features to moderate interior temperatures. Such techniques include:
- use of deciduous shade trees and other plants to protect the home;
 - use of natural or artificial flowing water; and
 - use of trees and hedges as windbreaks.

In addition to natural techniques, a number of modern methods of energy conservation have been developed or advanced during the present century. These include:

- use of solar energy to heat water;
- use of tankless water heaters;
- use of radiant barriers on roofs to keep attics cool;
- use of solar panels and other devices to generate electricity;
- high efficiency coating on windows to repel summer heat and trap winter warmth;
- weather-stripping and other insulation to reduce heat gain and loss;
- use of natural gas for dryers, stovetops and ranges;
- use of energy efficient home appliances; and
- use of low-flow showerheads and faucet aerators to reduce hot water use.

Natural space heating can be substantially increased through the proper location of windows and thermal mass. Use of solar panels can generate 1,000 watts of electricity on a sunny day. This can constitute more than enough power for daily residential operations.